JS

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
OCT 5 1962
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

E269
.C3M5

Jesuit Studies

Contributions to the arts and sciences

by members of the Society of Jesus

Jesuit Studies

The Churches and the Schools
FRANCIS X. CURRAN

Deception in Elizabethan Comedy
JOHN V. CURRY

Bishop Lancelot Andrewes
MAURICE F. REIDY

Master Alcuin, Liturgist
GERALD ELLARD

Theodore Dwight Woolsey
GEORGE A. KING

The Praise of Wisdom
EDWARD L. SURTZ

The Wagner Housing Act
TIMOTHY L. McDONNELL

The Honor of Being a Man
EDWARD GANNON

The Presidential Election of 1880
HERBERT J. CLANCY

Work and Education
JOHN W. DONOHUE

Northern Parish
JOSEPH B. SCHUYLER

The Frontier Wage
BERNARD W. DEMPSEY

St. Thomas Aquinas on Analogy
GEORGE P. KLUBERTANZ

King and Church
W. EUGENE SHIELS

JESUIT STUDIES

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
OCT 5 1962
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Catholics and the American Revolution

A STUDY IN RELIGIOUS CLIMATE

Charles H. Metzger, S.J.

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY PRESS

Chicago, 1962

© 1962

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY PRESS
Printed in the United States of America
Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 61-12646

IMPRIMI POTEST: John A. McGrail, S.J.
Provincial of the Detroit Province
March 21, 1961
IMPRIMATUR: ✠ Albert Cardinal Meyer
Archbishop of Chicago
March 23, 1961

INTRODUCTION

This is a study of the attitude of American Catholics towards the American Revolution, and their role in that world-shaping upheaval. We do not attempt to ascertain the precise number of Catholics in the Revolutionary armed services or to list their names, for we subscribe to Guilday's conviction that, for rather obvious reasons, these are impossible and unrewarding undertakings.[1] Consequently many names are passed over in silence; we shall rest satisfied with approximating the Catholic quota as closely as the defective records permit. And since standard biographies cover in detail the careers of the more distinguished Catholics such as Charles Carroll, Father John Carroll, and Captain John Barry, it seems superfluous to rehearse what has been said. These biographies may be found in any good library. If so inclined, the reader should consult them for detailed accounts of the respective contributions of these and other individuals to the patriot cause.

We are conscious that denominational history is suspect because so much of it is blindly partisan, an apology for or a glorification of a group rather than a scholarly inquiry into and a factual presentation of the record. In great part this is owing to the circumstance that so much of this type of history is proffered by writers whose knowledge of the subject in its impacts and ramifications is limited and whose scholarship not infrequently yields to enthusiasm, as their proneness to credit legends bears witness.[2] Excessive enthusiasm guides their pens and warps their judgment, with consequent havoc to their scholarship.

---

[1] "All attempts, however laudable, to ascertain the exact quota of American and foreign Catholic soldiers in the Revolutionary Army are of little value since they are based on criteria which cannot bear thorough investigation" (Peter Guilday, *John Carroll*, p. 89. [New York, 1922]).

Apropos of historians of this type Dr. Guilday has observed that, acting as if it were proper, regardless of proof, to lay claim to whatever suits their purpose, they distort or magnify minutiae and suavely ignore, play down, or reject what is unpleasant or a refutation of their theory. Finally, they blandly devise new rules of evidence of very dubious character. One such device is the theory that, because men and women of a certain name are usually found to be Catholics, therefore any individual of that name must be a Catholic even if no evidence establishes the fact; or the less bold begin by simple conjecture that the person may have been a Catholic, then quickly leap from surmise to certainty and proceed on this unwarranted assumption. Obviously, such procedure exposes writers to errors and patent contradictions, and thus frustrates their very purpose. In this study we have striven to be mindful of these and other pitfalls and to be on our guard against them.

Phenomenal changes have taken place in the United States since the American Revolution, and one of the most striking is the altered status of Catholics and their Church. In 1776 the Catholic Church in America was an inconspicuous institution, her children few and devoid of power or influence. In the interval since the founding of the colonies they had run the gamut of disregard, suspicion, disapproval, open hostility, and persecution. Denied some of the basic rights and substantial privileges of citizenship, excluded from educational opportunities, forbidden the franchise and the holding of office, they were outcasts, able to share only on a limited scale in the activities of the communities in which they resided. It is difficult to appreciate how frustrated Catholics must have been after decades of this experience. And since this attitude of their neighbors was a heritage normally bequeathed by parents to their children, for Catholics there seemed no escape, no promise of a better day. There was a formidable obstacle to wholehearted cooperation with their fellow citizens.

---

[2] "Many of these legends bear the stamp of their origin, namely, over-zealous enthusiasm to claim as much glory as possible; others are subtle and require historical disproof" (*Ibid.*, p. 90).

It is of the utmost importance to grasp this reality in order to appraise the significance of the espousing of the patriot cause by the Catholic body. For so great was the abuse to which Catholics had been subjected, such the legacy of misunderstanding and of open attack, that a prominent scholar has maintained that the "wonder is that the Catholic body, after a century of persecution by the colonial leaders, did not remain entirely neutral."[3] If anything, Monsignor Guilday indulged in understatement when he observed that the "American Catholics in 1775 had little to choose in either side of the quarrel."[4] This is strong language which may shock the reader; but facts must be faced, for we are concerned with history, not with fiction. To dismiss this dreary record of decades of covert and open hostility in a single chapter would so tone it down and rob it of its full force as to unfit the reader for a sound appraisal of the situation. Since only a somewhat detailed presentation of the facts, however unpleasant they may be, will bring out the lot and the experience of Catholics and picture their actual relationship to their neighbors, we feel compelled to devote several chapters to this background, in order to recreate the atmosphere and religious climate of 1776 as a necessary prelude to assessing the role of Catholics in the American Revolution.

---

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 83.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 89.

Articles and books have appeared on the subject of our investigation, the most notable being the three-volume *Catholics in the American Revolution* by Martin I. J. Griffin published five decades ago. These volumes are not a running narrative, but a compilation of extracts from various sources, with or without comment. As a pioneer effort this work has distinct merit, but the passage of time makes it more or less obsolete because of the unearthing of a wealth of new evidence unknown or inaccessible to Griffin. A new appraisal, based in large part on this new evidence, seems to be in order.

The author takes this occasion to express his deep appreciation of the courtesy and helpfulness invariably accorded him by the directors and staffs of the libraries where he conducted his research. Specific mention must be made of the William L. Clements Library, the American Antiquarian Society Library, the libraries of the Massachusetts Historical Society, the New York Historical Society, the Pennsylvania Historical Society, and the Maryland Historical Society. In each of these depositories the burden of labor was lightened by the kindly assistance and professional knowledge offered so unsparingly. Thanks are also due to a host of individuals who in one way or another contributed to this volume. Although their very number precludes their mention, they should be assured of the author's sense of indebtedness. As the references make clear, all known sources were combed for information. For obvious reasons the records and documents of the Maryland Historical Society, supplemented by the records of the early Catholic parishes in southern Maryland now housed in the archives of Woodstock College, proved of exceptional help in evaluating the contribution made by Catholics to the American Revolution. Without these documents many facts and many facets of Catholic activity would not have come to light.

CONTENTS

Introduction vii

I. Colonial Religious Climate before 1774 1

II. A Tempest Unleashed by the Quebec Act 24

III. The Crest and the Ebb of the Tide 48

IV. Maryland before 1776 71

V. Pennsylvania before 1776 97

VI. A Presbyterian War? 118

VII. How Numerous the Catholics? 138

VIII. Catholics or Only Celts? 154

IX. Maryland Catholics in the Revolution 177

X. Pennsylvania Catholics in the Revolution 208

XI. Catholic Tories 237

XII. Conclusion 267

Bibliography 281

Index 297

CHAPTER I

Colonial Religious Climate before 1774

For several generations before the founding of the first permanent English colony on the mainland of North America, England had been subjected to the ordeal of religious change and adjustment. The Tudor sovereigns from Henry VIII to Elizabeth I molded religion as expediency, conviction, or personal interest dictated. Anticipating the "cuius regio eius religio" motto of Augsburg, Henry VIII, through the medium of the Act of Supremacy and supplementary acts of Parliament, had elaborated his own Henrician system of dogma and ritual, and made it mandatory on his subjects under severe penalties. While he appears to have nursed the illusion that his deviations from traditional Catholicism were final and destined to endure in perpetuity, in reality he was only inaugurating a series of revisions and adaptations extending through the remainder of the century. Hardly had he been consigned to his grave when, under Edward VI, further and more drastic departures from Catholicism were brought about by Somerset and Northumberland, aided by Archbishop Cranmer. In turn Queen Mary reverted to the Catholicism of her father's youth, but Elizabeth discarded the creed of her sister, rejected the system devised by her father, and sanctioned a form of Protestantism more extreme than that advocated by her brother.

The net result of this chronic tampering with the religion which, for close to a thousand years, had been that of the realm was that by the death of Elizabeth in 1603 the rejection of Catholicism was official. A new system, unlike the Lutheranism of Germany and Scandinavia or the Calvinism of Switzerland, the Netherlands, and Scotland, had emerged. But the belief of kings and queens in the finality of their royal enactments proved illusory. From the basic Protestant postulate of the right of each individual to interpret the Scriptures stemmed the corollary that no one, not even a sovereign, could logically impose his conception of belief on another: orthodoxy was subjective and relative; each person was final judge. In time this conviction would generate, first latent, then open, opposition to the imposition of an official creed.

Moreover, this periodic alteration of religious tenets and practice, when the accession of a new sovereign might imply the outlawing of one creed and the legalizing of another, and the transforming of orthodoxy into heterodoxy, was disastrous to all belief. Plagued by the lack of stability in belief, not a few Englishmen lost concern about religion and, bereft of religious convictions, grew enamored of wealth and power, capitalized on the opportunities offered by the times, and became so engrossed in material pursuits as to exclude spiritual interests. And when coercion failed to effect acceptance of royal or parliamentary conceptions of orthodoxy, compliance in the form of mere outward conformity was accepted. Intellectual assent gave place to outward forms. Under the circumstances it was not difficult for the material minded to comply.

To others, however—a minority perhaps—religion took on new importance. It grew to be their chief concern; convictions made them aggressive and prone to controversy. Although they might disagree as to what were the essentials of true religion, they were nevertheless of one mind in opposition to the creed of pre-Tudor days and they were unanimous in dilating on the utter wickedness of that Church and its communicants. Against the Catholic Church the full fury of their attack was unleashed: it was anathema; its dogmas, its ritual, its practices, its adherents were held up to ridicule and denunciation. Of course, gross inconsistency marked the outlook and conduct of these zealots; for while they championed the sacred right of worshiping according to the dictates of their own consciences, they put restrictions on this right in respect to those who entertained different views and they denied it altogether to those who still adhered to the ancient faith.

An era of religious controversy dawned, and promptly grew in volume and bitterness. To a degree it usurped the pulpit. It became an outstanding phase of literary expression. At times, in disregard of Christ's injunction to charity, clergymen and laymen abruptly became experts in theology, not only vigorously advocating their understanding of Christianity, but even more vehemently denouncing all who cherished a belief at a variance with their own. Eventually this war of words would yield to physical strife; England and western Europe were heading towards the destructive religious wars which would levy a fearful toll of lives and treasure. But for the time being the English government was watchful and resolute in opposing the dissemination of religious sentiments incompatible with the official religion. This policy of repression could not but embitter those whose convictions were deep; for as physical resistance was still futile and foredoomed to failure, the spoken and written word was their only vehicle for broadcasting their opinions. Thus, penalized by law in the land of their birth and irritated by this abridgment of their rights, they were driven underground, an explosive segment of the public ready to seize any opportunity to redress their wrongs. Under the circumstances distant America loomed as a haven where these dissenters would be so remote from their homeland that the likelihood of any interference with their religious practices by the home government would be greatly reduced. Furthermore, in the vast expanse of the New World people who were of one mind could flock together, practice religion as they understood it, and exclude from their community all dissentients. Thus some of the English colonies on the North America mainland would owe their inception, in good part at least, to persecution of their inhabitants in the mother country and the earnest desire of these people to escape from religious oppression.

The seventeenth century, during which most of England's American colonies came into being, was not a tolerant age. Indeed, toleration was regarded as weakness, a betrayal of truth, closely akin to apostasy. And the pioneer colonists were largely of this frame of mind. In the more cosmopolitan colonies west and south of New England, the early coexistence of various denominations made some forbearance, some degree of toleration, imperative; for unless men and women of different sects restrained themselves and cooperated for the general good, their enterprise was doomed to failure. In these communities people who held divergent, even contradictory, beliefs were forced through sheer necessity to live and let live. New England, on the contrary, was more homogeneous in religion as well as in national extraction. In this area, and particularly in Massachusetts, uniformity was attained by the exclusion or expulsion of religious undesirables; here the elect was guarded against contamination, and undefiled religion held sway. That this mode of procedure met with approval may be gleaned from the observations of Nathaniel Ward, "the simple cobbler of Aggawam," who became the minister of Ipswich late in 1634. According to Ward, Rhode Island and other more liberal-minded colonies provided "stable-room and litter for all kinds of consciences, be they never so dirty or jadish." In her exclusiveness Massachusetts was superior because "all Familists, Antinomians, Anabaptists, and all other Enthusiasts shall have free Liberty to keep away from us, and such as will come, to be gone as fast as they can, the sooner the better."[1] In Boston, because of this attitude, there was little diversity in religious opinions. Practically, there were only Anglicans and Congregationalists, the latter three or four times more numerous; there were "no Catholics, Quakers, Jews . . . no regular churches . . . of several kinds of protestants."[2] In Massachusetts the Puritan ideal was realized. Here, to all intents and purposes, the Congregational Church was established, and erring sons and daughters, such as Roger Williams and Anne Hutchinson, were quickly made to realize the error of their ways or were summarily excluded from the community. Quakers too would be the victims of Puritan intolerance, death by hanging being their lot.

While, as we have just seen, staunch Protestants might be opposed to the very presence of other Protestants of different belief, the full force of Puritan vigor was directed against those who professed "popery." They were especially abhorred. It was immaterial that Puritans, when persecuted in Virginia, had found welcome and asylum in Maryland.[3] Nursed as they were on Elizabethan tradition and Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*, they fell victim to such fearsomeness of the Church of Rome and its communicants as to cause us to wonder at their credulity. In sublime disdain of their ancestors and of the faith which had adorned England with magnificent cathedrals, many of them looked upon the Church of their forebears as the very embodiment of evil; its adherents were the enemies of mankind, addicted to every crime and infamy; its tenets destructive of the very foundations of human society. Not only were Catholics vigorously excluded from their communities, but war against them was transformed into a battle for Christ and His cause, a vindication of orthodoxy, a defence of liberty and humanity. For this reason the series of

---

[1] Samuel E. Morison, *Builders of the Bay Colony*, p. 238. Boston, 1930.

[2] William Tudor, *Life of James Otis*, pp. 446-47. Boston, 1823.

[3] George Bancroft, *The History of the United States*, thirteenth edition, Vol. 1, p. 261. 6 vols. Boston, 1846-1874.

French and Indian wars, instead of being regarded as a struggle for empire and furs and Indian trade and alliances, became to them a crusade against French papists. As such, these campaigns aroused deep and extensive religious fervor. For example, when new England forces embarked for an assault on the key French bastion at Louisburg, their standard was emblazoned with the motto "Nil desperandum, Christo duce."[4] In like spirit Parson Moody added a hatchet to his equipment for more effective iconoclasm in French churches and chapels,[5] and Deacon John Gray of Biddleford envied his confrère the opportunity to destroy images and to substitute "the true gospel of our Lord and Saviour" for papist perversion of religion in their places of worship.[6] Emulating her husband in anti-Catholic zeal, the invalid wife of Deacon Gray urged her sons to enlist in the worthy enterprise, and promised to support the expedition by "importunate" prayer.[7] Obviously the Jesuit blackrobes could not escape the special consideration of Puritan zealots. Of all Catholics they were held to excel in deceit and treachery. Under the guise of missionary activity among the aborigines, they were in reality only astute French propagandists. At their door was laid the charge that they assured the simple and credulous natives "that the Virgin Mary was born in Paris and that Our Savior was crucified at London by the English."[8] And Jesuit casuistry and adaptation of means to an end were found in "their canonizing a squaw by the name of St. Catherine, which piece of Jesuitical craft greatly endeared the Romish faith to the pagans, who by that means, besides the common benefit of addressing their prayers to the rest of the saints in the calendar, obtained the supernumerary advantages of a particular advocate and intercessor of their own."[9]

---

[4] Usher Parsons, *The Life of William Pepperell*, p. 52. Boston, 1856.

[5] *Ibid.*

[6] *Ibid.*

[7] *Ibid.*

[8] Theodore Sedgwick, *Memoir of the Life of William Livingston*, p. 97. NewYork, 1833.

Outstanding as a means to indoctrinate the intelligentsia and to stimulate anti-Catholic animosity was the founding of the Dudleian lectures at Harvard. A graduate of that institution, Paul Dudley, applied himself to the study of law at the Temple. In time he advanced to the position of attorney general of Massachusetts and finally to that of chief justice. In his last will he earmarked the sum of one hundred pounds sterling for an annual lecture or sermon to the students of his American alma mater, and designated four topics[10] to be in rotation the subject of the discourses. In the third of the four topics sentiments of Dudley towards Catholics and their creed are etched with uncommon exactitude, for this address was for "detecting, convicting and exposing the idolatry, errors and superstitions of the Romish church." That the spirit of the provision by Dudley was adhered to faithfully is manifest from the subjects treated[11] and from the known convictions of the clergymen to whom the discourse was entrusted. It is significant that John Adams approved of this series of lectures since he regarded "that fine institution of the late Chief Justice Dudley of a lecture against popery" as "evidence of a strong veneration for the memory of the first settlers, penetrating insight into the purpose and spirit of their policy and an earnest desire of perpetuating the blessings of it to posterity."[12]

---

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 98.

[10] (1) "For proving, explaining, and proper use and improvement of the principles of natural religion"; (2) "For the confirmation, illustration and improvement of the great articles of the Christian religion"; (3) "For detecting, convicting and exposing the idolatry, errors and superstitions of the Romish church"; (4) "For maintaining, explaining and proving the validity of the ordination of ministers and pastors of the churches and so their administration of the sacraments and ordinances of religion as the same has been practiced in New England from the beginning of it and so continued to this day" (Josiah Quincy, *The History of Harvard College*, Vol. 2, pp. 138-40. [2 vols. Boston, 1860]).

[11] Edward Wigglesworth, Infallibility, 1759; Thomas Foxcroft, Supremacy, 1761; Jonathan Mayhew, Popish Idolatry, 1765; Samuel Cooper, The Man of Sin, 1773; Edward Wigglesworth, Authority: Tradition, 1777; William Gordon, Transubstantiation, 1781; Joseph Willard, The Persecuting Spirit of the Romish Church, 1785.

So sensitive was public opinion and so attuned to anti-Catholic prejudice that it was hazardous, almost fatal, to temporize ever so slightly with that creed or its adherents. Even purely personal matters were no exception, nor were popular idols immune, as Governor William Shirley discovered. A drastic abridgment of his popularity ensued when, in pursuit of domestic felicity, he lost his heart to a young Catholic French girl in Paris and made her his wife. Public reaction to this union was so unfavorable that Doctor Andrew Eliot boldly declared it to be "disgusting to the province, as the people at that time detested the French and all popish connections."[13]

Inevitably the outbreak of the last of the French and Indian wars precipitated a prompt and sustained outburst of anti-Catholic invective. Disregarding the root causes of the conflict, writers and speakers fixed their attention on the Catholic religion of the enemy and stressed this aspect of the strife. Clergy and laity vied with one another in fanning the flames of religious animosity. John Adams opened the campaign when he denounced the Church of Rome because "the influence of ignorant and wicked priests" had made it an article of faith that no one could be saved outside their Church.[14] At once some ministers rallied to the banner unfurled by Adams, among them John Ballentine of Westfield. To enkindle the military and religious ardor of Captain Mosely and his men on the eve of their setting out for Crown Point, he assured them that "the people you are going against are a Limb of that Mother of Harlots whom God has devoted to utter destruction, whose destruction is plainly foretold in the word of God."[15] Equally vigorous in disseminating rancor was Ebenezer Pemberton in an address to the artillery company in Boston. Envisioning the effect of defeat, he painted an appalling picture of "our cities in flames, our inhabitants desolated, our virgins deflowered, our streets deluged with Blood and the Temples of God prostituted in Superstition and Idolatry."[16]

---

[12] *On Canon and Feudal Law*, in John Adams, *Works*, edited by Charles F. Adams, Vol. 3, p. 454. 10 vols. Boston, 1850-1856.

[13] Parsons, *William Pepperell*, p. 295.

[14] Adams, *Works*, Vol. 2, p. 5.

But of all the expounders of the errors and iniquities of Catholicism, Jonathan Mayhew of West Church in Boston stood out as the foremost and most unrelenting. In the opinion of John Adams, Mayhew was unequaled among contemporaries in piety, virtue, and learning; his works would live so long as New England was true to her traditions. Obviously his influence in crystallizing public opinion would be tremendous. In his Dudleian lecture on "Idolatry," May 8, 1765, he emptied the vials of prejudice with a vehemence of language perhaps unparalleled in pulpit oratory. In the ears of his audience, largely made up of Harvard students, there rang the charges that the Church of Rome was guilty of idolatry in the "worship" of the Eucharist, saints, martyrs, angels, and especially of Mary; that canonization of the saints was an inferior and less justified imitation of the apotheosis of the pagans. Continuing he said: "But it must be remembered that some of these men whom the pagans deified had really been great benefactors of their respective countries and ages—they had at least as good a title to great honors, both living and after their decease, as some of the popish saints; I think a much better. For diverse of those who adorn the Roman Kalendar were but ignorant enthusiasts, scarce better than madmen; persons who never did anything worthy of applause."[17]

---

[15] John Ballentine, Sermon, June 2, 1756, p. 2. Boston, 1756.

[16] Ebenezer Pemberton, Sermon to Artillery Company of Boston, p. 16. Boston, 1756.

[17] Jonathan Mayhew, Popish Idolatry: A Discourse Delivered in the Chapel of Harvard College, May 8, 1765, p. 36. Boston, 1765.

"Were not Osiris, Hercules and Aesculapius, Vulcan, Rhadamanthus and Romulus, at least as worthy to be enrolled among the gods as Ignatius Loyola, Garnet, and Thomas a Becket among the saints?"[18] Rome he assailed as the implacable enemy of liberty. Far from being "the only true church and the Chaste Spouse of Christ" as she professed, she was in truth "a most corrupt one, a filthy prostitute, who hath forsaken her first love and is become indeed, the mother of harlots."[19] So unchristian and inherently vicious was she that he would reckon idolatry itself among her lesser errors and abominations.[20] The peroration of this unique address delivered by Jonathan Mayhew of West Church in Boston to the students of Harvard College was the prayer that "this seminary of learning . . . the people, ministers and churches of New England be preserved from popish and all other pernicious errors."[21]

This awful indictment of Rome was but an echo of like sentiments voiced on other occasions. In a Thanksgiving sermon in 1762, Mayhew thanked God that he had been spared the misfortune of being born in the "errors, superstitions and idolatries of the Church of Rome."[22] And four years earlier he had argued to his satisfaction and the acceptance of his audience that a Catholic sovereign was bound in conscience to distress, even to destroy, his Protestant subjects "for the good of their souls."[23] Under the impact of the near hysteria generated by the French and Indian War, he insisted that the sequel to a French victory would be the indiscriminate butchering of Protestants by the "blind and furious zealots of the religion of Rome under the direction of a priestcraft and hierarchy,"[24] extinction of the Protestant religion, and the domination of "the successor of the apostle Judas and grand vicar of Satan."[25] Small wonder that, confronted by such language, a recent scholar, well versed in his subject and free from prejudice against the preacher, was inclined to characterize this and similar outcries of Mayhew as "the ravings of an eloquent maniac" but for the fact that he was merely putting into words the thoughts and sincere beliefs of many of his contemporaries.[26]

---

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 37.

[19] *Ibid.*, pp. 43-44.

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 44. "Every true son and daughter of which is, and must be an idolater."

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 51.

[22] Jonathan Mayhew, Thanksgiving Sermon, Second Sermon, December 9, 1762, p. 71. Boston, 1763.

[23] Jonathan Mayhew, Thanksgiving Sermon for the Success of His Majesty's Arms, November 23, 1758, p. 33. Boston, 1758.

In enkindling and fanning the flames of hostility to Catholics and their religion the laity emulated the clergy. Conspicuous in the endeavor were John and Sam Adams. In observations concerning *On Canon and Feudal Law* which appeared anonymously and without title in four issues of the *Boston Gazette* in 1765, John Adams gave expression to his convictions and free rein to his utter dislike of the Church which had developed and implemented canon law. By protesting that his words were "not the vapor of a melancholy mind, nor the effusions of envy, disappointed ambition, nor a spirit of opposition to government, but the emanation of a heart that burns for its country's welfare,"[27] he leaves us no alternative to accepting his strictures as truly mirroring his sentiments. Indeed, he insisted that deep thought had begotten his convictions. Adams, for example, detected true foresight in the early New England settlers, "in curbing the power of Monarch and Priest," lest government "become the man of sin, the whore of Babylon, the mystery of iniquity."[28] Likewise he commended them for stripping away the fantastical ideas which clothed the priesthood with an air of "mystery, sanctity, reverence;"[29] he denounced absolution from sin as the "most extravagant nonsense and delusion."[30] The Catholic clergy he accused of grossest hypocrisy, deception, and blasphemy. Because his words bespeak his mind, we quote: "They [the Catholic clergy] even persuaded mankind to believe . . . that God Almighty had entrusted them . . . with authority to license all sorts of sins and crimes . . . with the power of procuring or withholding the rain of heaven and the beams of the sun; with the management of earthquakes, pestilence and famine; nay with the mysterious, awful, incomprehensible power of creating out of bread and wine the flesh and blood of God Himself. All these opinions they were able to spread and rivet among the people by reducing their minds to a state of sordid ignorance and startling timidity and by infusing into them a religious horror of letters and knowledge. Thus was human nature chained fast for ages."[31]

---

[24] Jonathan Mayhew, Thanksgiving Sermon on the Reduction of Canada, October 25, 1759, p. 47. Boston, 1759.

[25] Frank Moore, editor, *Patriot Preachers of the Revolution*, p. 28. New York, 1862.

[26] Moses C. Tyler, *The Literary History of the American Revolution*, Vol. 1, pp. 133-34. 2 vols. New York, 1897.

[27] Adams, *Works*, Vol. 3, pp. 448-64.

[28] *Ibid.*, pp. 452-53.

Sam Adams, the other of the "brace of Adamses," was no less vocal or acrimonious. Over a period of four years, from 1768 to 1771, his mouthpiece, the *Boston Gazette*, regaled its readers with his anonymous fulminations against popery.[32] True it is that the issue of his sincerity has been raised, and his articles have been set down as the words of political expediency.[33] Then too one marvels how he honestly could have believed that his creed and that of his fellows could be exposed to such extreme peril by the presence of a few Catholics in their midst. Sam

---

[29] *Ibid.*, p. 453.

[30] *Ibid.*, pp. 449-50.

[31] *Ibid.*

[32] In 1768 and 1769 Adams contributed articles under the pseudonyms of "Vindex," "A Layman," "A Puritan," "An Impartialist," "Alfred Shippen," "A Tory," "A Bostonian," "Populus," "T.Z." In 1770 and 1771 he added "Candidus," "Valerius Poplicola," "A Chatterer," "Determinatus," "Cotton Mather."

[33] Tudor, *James Otis*, pp. 274, 276.

Adams was a complex and enigmatic character, unique and defying analysis.

Of his contributions to the press three letters to the editor of the *Boston Gazette* in April 1768 are typical. These self-styled "lucubrations to oppose popery" stress the appalling menace of popery. His apprehension on this score stemmed from observation and travel. Though he was fully aware that in voicing his misgivings he would only evoke sneers and ridicule in some quarters, he was determined to dwell on "this monstrous and melancholy subject"; undaunted by abuse, he would persist in his endeavors to prevent the continent from becoming "worshippers of the Beast." Impelled by this resolution, he pleaded that his readers suffer him "in the bowels of my compassion to warn you all, as you value your precious civil Liberty and everything that you can call dear to you, to be on your guard against Popery."[34] To confirm or dispel his forebodings he had journeyed through the colony, and confirmation of his misgivings had resulted. "The more I know the circumstances of America, I am sorry to say it, the more reason I find to be apprehensive of Popery."[35] "Bless me," he cried out, "could our ancestors look out of their graves and see so many of their own sons, decked with the worst of foreign superfluities, the ornaments of the whore of Babylon, how would it break their sacred repose!"[36] To some extent his agony of spirit had been mitigated by the discovery that some towns had evinced a "laudable zeal against Popery." In recognition he would publish an honor roll of such communities; their zeal in withstanding "Popish accretions" would be proclaimed. But a week of reflection and discussion only verified Adams' conviction that popery was making inroads and that the agents of popery were alert and active. "I did verily believe," he lamented, "and I do so still, that much more is to be dreaded from the growth of popery in America, than from the Stamp Act or any other acts destructive of civil rights; nay, I could not help fancying that the Stamp Act itself was contrived with a design only to inure the people to the habit of contemplating themselves as the slaves of men; and the transition thence to a subjection to Satan is mighty easy."[37] In utter wonderment one asks whether Adams could truly believe what his words assert and imply; for Catholics in New England were so few, so unorganized, and so impotent that even if they had actually entertained the sinister designs that Adams attributed to them, they could not possibly have effected their realization.

---

[34] *Boston Gazette*, April 4, 1768.
[35] *Ibid.*
[36] *Ibid.*

The compilation of the honor list proved more difficult than anticipated because few municipalities measured up to the exacting standards set by Adams. For instance, Charlestown had a good record inasmuch as it had never been represented by a papist, but in Adams' opinion it was "not so much on its guard against popery" as it should be. Other places were even more at fault. According to report, Salem and Marblehead had been visited by a "Romish priest" who, "resorting to all his arts and tricks," had enticed some "to wander after the beast," but repentance was certain now that their eyes were opened. Haverhill, too, had compromised itself, but Adams was relieved by the word of a reliable person that within six weeks proof would be furnished that the majority of the inhabitants were enemies of popery. In York, despite the activity of an able pastor and the town's reputation for orthodoxy, some people, presumably women, had ventured to appear in public with "crucifixes" at their breasts; but "such glaring appearance of popery" would be stamped out by effective measures. Hatfield may have been a victim of misrepresentation, but its reputation was tarnished. Only Northampton, it appears, qualified without reservation;

---

[37] *Ibid.*, April 11, 1768.

Northampton was "a true blue Protestant town." The list ends abruptly. Other towns in Massachusetts were never assessed. Were they such as Adams would have them be, or did he think it expedient to ignore their delinquency? Silence simplified his task and it gave no offence to communities jealous of their good name and sensitive to even the slightest intimation of lukewarmness in Protestantism.

The New England press cooperated with Sam Adams and his colleagues. In news items and correspondence all the variations of indictment of Catholic people and doctrine were revived, thus imparting new life to old charges and fabricating new ones. That as a rule they were unfounded and illogical, often contradictory, mattered not. When prejudice clouds and warps the mind sound judgment surrenders to emotion. Minutiae were magnified into events of importance; to almost any happening or situation religious significance was attached. Thus, the presence of a Catholic priest in Nova Scotia was hailed as a most daring assault on the Protestant religion.[38] The *Providence Gazette*[39] offered the radical suggestion that Guy Fawkes Day, November 5, be substituted for March 5, anniversary of the Boston massacre, so that American "haters of popery and true friends of the protestant religion" could unite with their British brethren "in bearing testimony against those sons of Belial who aimed at the destruction of our religion and liberty." So harmless a thing as the music of fifes and drums on the Sabbath was held to be a subtle plot of those who aimed at "introducing Papistical ceremonies into a Protestant land," who sneered at the religion of their forefathers, and who even stood sponsor for a child "crossed in Popish modes."[40] The canonization of saints was held up to derision,[41] and the pope and cardinals were pictured as simple-tons.[42] Their utter lack of the basic instincts of justice and charity, and the fanatical dedication of Catholics to the interests of their Church were affirmed in the allegation that "there is not a papist in the world who would not cut the throat of his nearest relation when the interest of mother church is concerned."[43] Similarly it was said to be a tenet of the Church of Rome that oaths and agreements with Protestants did not bind her sons and daughters in any respect.[44]

---

[38] *Ibid.*, November 19, 1770.

[39] *Providence Gazette*, February 16-23, 1771.

[40] *Massachusetts Spy*, March 21, 1771.

[41] *Ibid.*, June 13, 1771.

But the *ne plus ultra* in derision was a preposterous canard which appeared in the *Boston Evening Post* in November 1772 and which was promptly copied by the *Connecticut Courant*. According to this fantastic tale, a violent thunderstorm in Rome on St. Bartholomew's day had defied the laws of nature, evinced uncanny intelligence in selecting objects for destruction, and worked a whole series of marvels all indicative of divine disapproval of the Mass, the priesthood, and the veneration of images. Conscience-stricken over their previous idolatry, the masses at once repudiated their former creed, raised a shout for Protestantism, and embarked on a pilgrimage of iconoclasm to the churches, chapels, and convents of the city. Finally they converged on the papal palace, where the pope and many of the cardinals publicly abjured their errors. Those who refused to recant were manhandled and exiled. When the turmoil spread through the dominion of the pope, he dispatched couriers to the Protestant sovereigns of England and Prussia pleading for aid. Other recantations followed, but some reactionary cardinals and the Jesuits remained unshaken in their faith. Among the recent converts to Protestantism the widest differences of opinion prevailed as to which of the reformed religious systems should serve as guide for the pope in the changes that he must make, but he inclined towards the system of Mr. Whitefield. For the present, however, Rome swarmed with sectaries, each loudly proclaiming the superiority of his creed; but the conversion of the pope was beyond doubt, for he donned lay dress, discarded the austerity characteristic of popes, gave a splendid ball at the Vatican, and danced with the princess of Monaco. "Thus it pleased heaven to strike a blow at the Root of a Religion founded upon Ignorance, Imposition and Bloodshed, and to perform in one Day what the combined powers of the Reformed Churches could not have effected in Ages."[45]

---

[42] *Ibid.*, November 28, 1771.

[43] *Ibid.*, June 6, 1771.

[44] *Ibid.*, January 30, 1772.

Obviously one may dismiss this tale as the wild fantasy of a disordered mind or as the fabrication of a humorist bent on hoaxing the public. Nevertheless, the fact that editors saw fit to admit it to their columns is an index of what entertained the public and tickled their prejudices. Although as a rule people resent any lampooning of what they cherish, there were no protests against the printing of this arrant nonsense. One strange inconsistency stands forth: the imminent triumph of Whitefield. That he should be so favored argues a slight oversight on the part of the watchdogs of Puritanism.

However one may regard this tale, a more valid index of what appealed to Protestants of the day is had in a book that appeared at this juncture. There can be no doubt as to its genuineness or its purpose. Antonio Gavin was born, educated, and ordained a priest in Spain. After some years he renounced his spiritual allegiance and became a minister in the Church of England. About a decade later he produced a book which for more than a century served as an arsenal from which the enemies of the Catholic Church could draw weapons. In *A Master Key to Popery* he attacked the Church of his early life with a venom peculiar to such as he. Each of the five chapters betrays his animus. In turn he expatiates on auricular confession, indulgences, the Mass, the

---

[45] *Boston Evening Post*, November 23, 1772.

Inquisition, the "adoration of Images and Relics"—all time-honored subjects of misrepresentation and attack. Prefacing his first chapter with the pharisaical wish that he were blessed with "the style of an angel to narrate with purity and modesty," he dilates on every phase of sexual aberration and obscenity, even on supposed intercourse with demons. Through copious salacious details he attempts to convert the confessional into a place of unrestrained lewdness, and penitent and confessor into monsters of dissoluteness. Even the most prurient should have been sated by his narrative.

This unsavory disquisition, first published in London in 1725, was republished in Newport in 1773 under the auspices of Solomon Southwick, editor of the *Newport Mercury*. Prior to the publication, notices appeared in the *Massachusetts Spy* and the *Boston Evening Post*, as well as in the *Newport Mercury*.[46] In an advance notice in 1773, Southwick addressed "all Protestants of every denomination throughout America and all other friends to civil and religious liberty." As an incentive to subscribing he argued that success in establishing "the diabolical doctrines of Roman Catholics or popery . . . would endanger, even destroy, every liberty, civil and religious, dear to a rational being," and inflict "wooden shoes, fetters, chains, racks, burning to death, with every other hellish torture practicised by the Inquisition" upon all who should presume to deny a single article of the "blasphemous" creed of the Church of Rome. For these compelling reasons he pleaded for substantial support of the forthcoming publication. The response must have been immediate, for the book appeared in 1773. Later its sale was promoted by the declaration that it was "highly necessary to be kept in every protestant family in this country" and "very necessary to be read by every American Protestant at this alarming crisis."[47] Another advertisement in November 1773 played up the theme "it can happen here."

---

[46] Notices appeared in the *Massachusetts Spy* and the *Boston Evening Post* in February 1773; advertisements appeared repeatedly in the *Newport Mercury* in 1773 and 1774, for example, November 1, 8, 22, 29, December 13, 20, 27, 1773, and January 3, 24, 31, 1774.

In this highly charged atmosphere even stout Puritan hearts quailed. To Ezra Stiles, later president of Yale, the prospect was forbidding, the horizon darkened by impending catastrophe in the defection of many Puritans and in their bending "the Knee to Baal." But he was heartened by the thought that at America's maturity the "bigger Two Thirds of the population of New England will be Presbyterians or Episcopalians." The latter he disliked. The development he envisioned would be brought about by the intervention of an irresistible, overruling Providence thwarting all the "Pharoahs, Zumzummins, the Nebuchadnezzars, the Plagues of a Holy People."[48] Nor did Stiles rest content with this attempt at prognostication, for on February 18, 1773, he predicted within a century the expansion of New England to include the entire area north of 40 degrees, and the establishment of the Congregational and Presbyterian churches in this vineyard of the Lord. Rarely are the hazards attending prophecy more manifest than in this brave venture by Stiles. How different the New England of 1873 from that conjured up by his errant imagination!

The fears that disturbed the spirit of Ezra Stiles were shared by others of the cloth, notably by Charles Turner of Duxbury and Samuel Cooper of the Brattle Street Church in Boston. The former aired his disquietude and grievances in an election sermon before Governor Thomas Hutchinson on May 26, 1773.[49] He descanted on the perils that menaced "civil privileges," for the laws of England against popery were not enforced inasmuch as there was a Catholic bishop in Canada and a "popish priest" in Nova Scotia. Could anyone be blind or insensible to the threat implied in these abuses?

---

[47] *Newport Mercury Supplement*, February 14, 1774.

[48] Ezra Stiles, *The Literary Diary of Ezra Stiles*, edited by Franklin B. Dexter, Vol. 1, p. 344. 2 vols. New York, 1901.

[49] Charles Turner, Election Sermon before Governor Hutchinson, p. 39. Boston, 1773.

But when Samuel Cooper entered the pulpit to deliver the Dudleian lecture in 1773, he indulged in invective that matched the efforts of Mayhew and other predecessors. The very title of his discourse, "The Man of Sin," boded ill for Catholics and the spirit of toleration. Cooper began his address to the faculty and student body of Harvard with the announcement that "the very intrinsic absurdity" of the Romish Church made refutation of its pretensions a simple matter. Besides, was not popery "in direct opposition to the first notices of the human mind in a religious inquiry"?[50] By way of parenthesis we observe that this comes close to saying that there could be no real contest, no test of skill, that he was tilting with scarecrows. And, he continued, since Scripture, reason, and common sense were unanimous in rejecting the tenets and practices of that Church, there was no need to have recourse to prophecy to show that "Popery is, in a true and proper sense, anti-Christian."[51] Were not Mariolatry and "saint worship" substituted for the worship "of the one God and Father of all"?[52] Was not the canonization of saints the same as the apotheosis of the pagans; were not holydays pagan festivals in disguise? In addition, popery was synonymous with extreme despotism. The recent assumption by popes of a milder attitude was a ruse to throw men off guard and disarm them, but popery was still popery and the evil most to be feared. A bishop in Canada and the priest in Nova Scotia were harbingers of calamity. Why was it that "even to this day the body of the people in the Romish are not near so enlightened as in Protestant communions"?[53] Clearly it was because popery was the avowed enemy of freedom, of inquiry, and of learning. Indeed, if any learning be found among Catholics, it could be ascribed to the Reformation,[54] which had jolted Rome out of its complacency.

---

[50] Samuel Cooper, The Man of Sin, p. 15. Boston, 1774.

[51] *Ibid.*, pp. 15-16

[52] *Ibid.*, p. 43.

[53] *Ibid.*, p. 58.

The evidence so far presented dispels all doubt as to the religious climate of New England in respect to Catholics. There can be no ambiguity on the point. Was New England unique, a contrast to the other colonies? Unfortunately, while New England surpassed all others in the frequency and vehemence of expressions of hostility, the same sentiments were shared elsewhere in America. And there too men of prominence were the spokesmen of intolerance.

In Pennsylvania, as early as 1747, Benjamin Franklin alerted the public to the threat to their security in the presence of a number of Catholics. Still another menace he detected in the activity of French missionaries among the Six Nations—the façade of religion cloaked their political activities. The bond of a common religion would incline those converted aborigines to the French should war break out.[55]

In the adjacent colony of New York, William Livingston, editor of the *Independent Reflector*, while involved in a discussion over the proposal to found a new college, digressed into a gratuitous denunciation of "the sanguinary and antichristian Church of Rome." In Livingston's estimation the "Transmutation of Sinners and Numskulls into Saints and Scholars by the hands of a protestant priest" was quite as feasible as "the Transubstantiation of the Elements into Flesh and Blood, by the mouth of a Romish Priest."[56] For political reasons he advocated exclusion of papists from the common benefits of society, but he urged extension of full liberty to all Protestants, without distinction.

---

[54] *Ibid.*, p. 57.

[55] Benjamin Franklin, *Plain Truth; or Serious Considerations on the Present State of the City of Philadelphia*, p. 32. Philadelphia, 1747.

[56] "On Creeds and Systems," *Independent Reflector*, Vol. 46, October 11, 1753.

Among the basic regulations in "A Scheme for the Settlement of a New Colony to the Westward of Pennsylvania"[57] submitted to the General Assembly of Connecticut, Ebenezer Hazard listed eligibility of Protestants of all denominations to all posts of honor, trust, or profit. As if this limitation did not suffice to exclude Catholics, restrictions on them were multiplied. They could hold no land or real estate, they could not own such property, they could not possess arms under any pretense whatsoever. Likewise no "Mass House or Popish Chapels" were allowed in the territory in question. The death of Hazard substituted Phineas Lynan[58] as the promotor of the enterprise, but it led to no revision of terms, no alleviation for Catholics. Preferably they should stay away, but if they came they must be content to be treated as outcasts and regarded as miscreants intent on villany however odious.

Thus New England was not alone in this crusade against papists; Virginia too had purveyors of rancor. Scarcely less harsh than Mayhew was Samuel Davis, shortly to be the fourth president of the College of New Jersey (Princeton), who, in an address on "Religion and Patriotism" delivered to Captain Overton's Independent Volunteers raised in Hanover County, Virginia, pictured "our Fellow Subjects on the frontier murdered with all the horrid acts of Indian and Popish Torture."[59] He fumed at the thought of Virginia exchanging "her Liberty, her Religion, and her All, for arbitrary Gallic Power and for Popish Slavery, Tyrrany and Massacre."[60] Appealing to his auditors' attachment to their religion, he urged enlistment because Protestant Christianity could expect no quarter from "Heathen Savages and French Papists," for "in such an Alliance the Powers of Hell make a Third Party."[61] Incentives to action he found in the preservation of their estates "from falling a Prey to greedy Vultures, Indians, Priests, Friers," (!) in shielding their religion against "Ignorance, Superstition, Idolatry, Tyranny over Conscience, Massacre, Fire and Sword, and all the Mischief beyond Expression with which Popery is pregnant"; and finally in the preservation of "your Wives, your Children, your Parents, your Friends from the cruel Hands of Barbarians and Papists. . . . Virginians! Britons! Christians! Protestants!" he shouted, "If these Names have any Import will you not strike Home in such a Cause."[62]

---

[57] Peter Force, editor, *American Archives*, fourth series, Vol. 1, p. 862. 6 vols. Washington, 1837-1846.

[58] Clarence W. Alvord, *The Mississippi Valley in British Politics*, Vol. 2, chap. 4. 2 vols. Cleveland, 1917.

[59] Samuel Davis, Religion and Patriotism, the Constituents of a Good Soldier, p. 2. Philadelphia, 1755.

[60] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

Even in Maryland, founded under Catholic auspices, and from the outset the Catholic haven, Catholics smarted under restrictions, and might suffer public rebuff. And Maryland's most noted son, Charles Carroll of Carrollton, enjoyed no immunity, as we shall see in a later chapter. Even he could be taunted with his religion and the civil and social consequences which such profession entailed.

Such, then, was the religious climate of British North America prior to 1774; such the status and everyday experience of Catholics. They lived in an atmosphere charged with suspicion, fear, and hatred; their rights were abridged; they were penalized and excluded from the full right of citizenship; everywhere they were harried by reproaches and misrepresentation. Hard as their lot had been, it would be aggravated by events in 1774 which liberated a torrent of abuse and denunciation surpassing in volume and virulence anything hitherto experienced.

---

[61] *Ibid.*, pp. 18-19.
[62] *Ibid.*, pp. 19-20.

CHAPTER II

A Tempest Unleashed by the Quebec Act

The Peace of Paris of 1763 marked high tide in British imperial fortunes in the western hemisphere. It highlighted not only the humiliation, but also the elimination, of a competitor and inveterate foe, and it added extensive territory to British dominion; it also brought to Britannia a host of problems the solution of which would be fraught with difficulty and danger. There was, for example, the assimilation of the new subjects, French by race, tradition, and custom and Catholic in creed. Additional problems were the regulation of their trade with the aborigines and the English colonies to the south, and the maintaining of English ideals of civil government and the system of law on which it was predicated. Finally, and perhaps most knotty of all, was the explosive issue of the Catholic religion of these people and the official British attitude towards its practice.

To each of these problems there were many angles, not one of which could be overlooked or ignored with impunity. Among the obstacles to solution may be cited the haphazard and conflicting colonial charters and grants, the titles of some colonies to western lands, British subjects' prerogative of being governed by their own and not a foreign code, and finally the proscription by numerous statutes of the realm of the free exercise of Catholicism, the all but universal creed of Canadians. The solving of these and other issues called for understanding, broadness of view, and real statesmanship. British officials, it must be conceded, applied themselves seriously and honestly to their many-sided task, but it is likewise true that they did not reckon fully with American sentiments and prejudices. The end product of their endeavors was the Quebec Act, now regarded as statecraft of high order, liberal in concept and intent. But the framers of the Quebec Act may have been amazed at the storm that broke in the colonies as a result of their well-meaning efforts.

What was the reaction of the American subjects of the king to the Quebec Act and why did they respond in this manner? The task of answering these inquiries was simplified by John Adams, who vouched for the freedom of the press in America in the discussion of public issues[1] and the reliability of the press, juries, town meetings, and assemblies in mirroring the feelings of the citizenry.[2] Obviously Adams overlooked the pulpit and the rostrum, equally potent in revealing the opinion of leaders in civil or religious life. Relying, then, on the assurance of Adams we apply ourselves to the task of exploring these indices of what people thought, insofar as they impinge on the subject of our inquiry. That Adams did not err in his estimate of the reliance of the public on their newspapers is attested by a British sailor, who records his amazement at their naive and absolute trust in the press and their conviction of its inerrancy.[3]

By August 1773 it was known in America that a bill for the governance of Canada was pending in Parliament, and it was feared that in its provisional form it would concede to Canadians the exercise of their religion as it had obtained under the French regime. Given the religious background and climate of the seaboard colonies as sketched in the previous chapter, it was inevitable that this phase of the bill would arouse their particular displeasure, dwarfing the opposition to other provisions of the bill.[4] On the issue of popery they were so sensitive that they would brook no mitigation of the penal laws in the statute books.[5] Thus there was spawned an avalanche of protest and denunciation so vast that it cannot be given in detail here. We must be content with selections as indicative of the general spirit and trend, and refer the reader to a fuller treatment.[6]

---

[1] Adams, *Works*, Vol. 8, p. 182.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] Margaret W. Willard, editor, *Letters on the American Revolution*, pp. 67-68. Boston, 1925.

With the publication of the text of the Quebec Act in Pennsylvania, New York, Connecticut, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Virginia in September 1774[7] a barrage was laid on Catholics, their creed, and the architects of the act. At first British reaction was stressed; colonial editors seized upon every wisp of news from abroad to whip up opposition to the act, predominantly on religious grounds. Lord North was depicted as pondering the feasibility of recruiting an army of "Papists in Canada" who would relish the opportunity "to cut the throats of those heretics in Boston."[8] The *Boston Evening Post* relayed the intelligence from abroad that "for the execution of this hellish plan" four thousand of his majesty's Catholic Canadian subjects were to be organized into four regiments.[9] The *New York Journal* regaled its readers with the story of how the London mob greeted the king "with a most cordial salute of groans and hisses" on his return from "executing the Romish business," surrounded his carriage, and raised the cry "No popery! No French laws! No Protestant popish king!"[10] And the *Boston Gazette* imparted the information that in England, Catholics and their sympathizers had grown so bold that court ladies adorned their persons with gold and silver pendant crosses, and "four Mass-houses" were open every day in Bury St. Edmunds.[11] Another report cited Edgebaston near Birmingham, where open Catholic services were conducted daily and priests were proselytizing.[12] General Carleton's appointment to Canada was viewed with alarm, for he was said to be empowered to embody a force of "30,000 R:C: Canadians"[13] (in a population of approximately 100,000!).

---

[4] Thomas Bernard, *An Appeal to the Public*, p. 57. London, 1774.

[5] *Rivington's New York Gazeteer*, December 8, 1774.

[6] Charles H. Metzger, *The Quebec Act*, Chap. 3. New York, 1936.

[7] *Pennsylvania Gazette*, August 31, 1774; *Rivington's New York Gazeteer*, September 2, 1774; *Providence Gazette*, September 3, 1774; *Pennsylvania Packet*, September 5, 1774; *Maryland Journal*, September 7, 1774; *Massachusetts Spy*, September 8, 1774; *New Hampshire Gazette*, September 9, 1774; *New York Journal*, September 15, 1774; *Maryland Gazette*, September 15, 1774; *Virginia Gazette* (Rind), September 15, 1774; *Connecticut Journal*, September 16, 1774; *Essex Gazette*, September 20, 1774.

[8] Broadside in the Massachusetts Historical Society Library, printed by John Anderson of New York.

[9] *Boston Evening Post*, December 26, 1774.

At times London reports touched the nadir in absurdity, but nevertheless they found place in American journals. There was, for example, the canard that Lord North had been favored with absolution because of his part in the enacting of the Quebec Act.[14] Equally preposterous was the imminent conferring of cardinals' red hats on each of the British archbishops, and the publication of a "Crusade against the Rebellious Bostonians, to excite Canadians, with the assistance of British soldiers, to extirpate those bitter enemies of the Romish religion and monarchical power."[15] Even more astounding to the public was the list of papal honors shortly to be conferred on Lord North, Lord Chatham, Charles Fox, Edmund Burke, and others for their role in furthering their obnoxious legislation.[16]

---

[10] *New York Journal*, August 25, 1774.

[11] *Boston Gazette*, September 26, 1774.

[12] *New York Journal*, October 20, 1774.

[13] *Maryland Gazette*, November 10, 1774.

[14] *Essex Gazette*, September 13, 1774.

[15] *Ibid.*; *New Hampshire Gazette*, September 16, 1774.

[16] "Lord North, Commissioner of Supply to the College of the Jesuits; Charles Fox, Arch Treasurer of the Holy Roman Empire; Edmund Burke, Professor of Oratory, University of Padua; Lord Chatham, Superior of the Holy House of

Such intelligence in conjunction with their religious background and reliance on the press terrified many men who, already receptive to such cries of alarm, really feared that the British government plotted the establishment of popery. And they appear to have believed that the nefarious plan for Canada was only the prelude to eventual establishment of popery in their midst, with consequent outlawing of their own cherished beliefs and practices.

However, not all were taken in by these excursions into propaganda. One doubting Thomas observed in the *Boston Gazette* that it was a "whimsical circumstance" that thousands who had no creed should be so unhappy and wrought up over the religion of the Canadians.[17] Still another offered the suggestion: "As to the Quebec Act let the Canadians go to the devil their own way. Who cares?"[18] In good humor the "Damsels of Montagoras" derided the fears of the anonymous and self-constituted champions of orthodoxy.[19] But neither raillery nor reason could prevail with minds said to be "able to out-Jesuit the keenest of the sons of Loyola,"[20] in discovering the establishment of the Roman Catholic religion in the Quebec Act. Prejudices were too inveterate, convictions too deep, to be eradicated so summarily. In Newport, for example, wishful thinking forecast "the downfall of the Pope and the whore of Babylon, after which the world may expect some peace."[21] And the readers of the *Pennsylvania Gazette* were asked what course a "protestant audience" should pursue now that "these dogs of Hell, Popish Superstition and

---

Loretta; Archbishop of Canterbury, Sovereign Pontiff: Mr. Horne, Crucifix Maker to His Most Catholic Majesty; His ————————, King of Canada. by the Title of Chevalier de St. George: Lord Mayor, Tea Man to the Pope" (*Massachusetts Spy*, September 22, 1774).

[17] *Boston Gazette*, September 26, 1774.

[18] *Boston Post Boy*, March 6, 1774.

[19] *Massachusetts Gazette and Boston Post Boy*, September 26, 1774.

[20] *Rivington's New York Gazeteer*, October 6, 1774.

[21] *Massachusetts Gazette and Boston Post Boy*, September 26, 1774.

French Tyranny, dare to erect their Heads and triumph within our Borders." In conclusion the writer prayed "that the Gates of Hell, the Gates of Rome, nor the Gates of France" might never prevail against Sion, the vineyard planted by God's own hand, and hitherto providentially preserved.[22] The solace of a small crumb of comfort, though derogatory to the people in Canada, was found in the fact that of all religious systems the "Papist is by far the fittest for a corrupt and immoral people," and the doctrines of that creed "most convenient for a people bent upon enjoying the pleasures of this world and having no thought of another," for in that Church "they may at small expense, have pardons in their pockets for committing every sin that suits their inclinations."[23] Tyranny was said to be endemic to papists and their religion, freedom was anathema. The irreconcilability of readily acquired permission to indulge in unrestricted moral license and tyranny over conscience must have escaped this moralist. Yes, tyranny must prevail in Catholic circles; it was rampant in Canada and it was being introduced into America. Thus the alleged kidnaping in Boston by British soldiers of a certain Samuel Dyre elicited the sharp comment of the *Newport Mercury* that such happenings, everyday occurrences in France, Spain, Portugal, and almost every Catholic country, were "a true spawn of Hell, nursed by the Church of Rome."[24]

As has been seen, Carleton's mission to Canada excited alarm. Now colonists were further irritated by an account of the presentation to him on arrival of an address by the bishop and the superiors of religious communities.[25] This convinced them that collaboration between British officials and the Canadian hierarchy was no chimera but stark reality.

---

[22] *Pennsylvania Gazette*, October 12, 1774.

[23] *New York Journal Supplement*, October 13, 1774.

[24] *Newport Mercury*, October 17, 1774.

[25] *Maryland Gazette*, October 27, 1774.

Under the stimulus of such inflamatory incitements to action, Pope Day in 1774 took on new significance. It was celebrated widely and with unusual enthusiasm; its initial religious aspects were emphasized. With the lapse of years the occasion had been altered from its original purpose of deriding the pope into an opportunity for rough fun and horseplay, and for settling personal grudges or sectional grievances. Charleston, South Carolina, revived the celebration to show "abhorrence of Pope and Pretender";[26] Newport outdid itself in featuring two large effigies of the pope. In Boston, Pope Day had degenerated into a bitter free-for-all between North End and South End, each group bent on guarding its own effigy and capturing that of its rival. After a parade through their respective sections of the town, the two parties met at Union Street, and a general brawl ensued. When victory rested with either party a triumphal march to headquarters on the Commons or Copp's Hill was climaxed by the burning of both popes. "A good jovial supper" ended the festivity. In 1774, however, the danger of dissension inherent in this method must be countered by a device to unify the people. Tactfully the origin and meaning of Pope Day were stressed, and a "Union Pope" served to unite all parties in a common cause. Such was the success of the scheme that it exceeded the expectations of the most sanguine. Public opinion was aroused and consolidated; it was directed towards the proper objective.

True, a critic such as Governor Bernard might ask embarrassing questions—on what score the colonists deemed themselves authorized to correct error by means of persecution[27] when so large a segment of humanity was involved, and did their creed warrant resort "to fire and faggot to make proselytes of a hundred thousand subjects"?[28] Would this not be tyranny at least equal to that ascribed to papists? And Samuel Johnson might ask whether tyranny was more commendable in a Protestant than in a papist. In the last analysis was liberty of conscience a natural right or a mere indulgence? In either case it should not be withheld from papists if granted to other sects. To deny them the toleration to which they were entitled as men and as Christians, said Bernard, was a denial of elementary justice and a denial likewise of the fundamental tenets of Christianity. Besides, had not Mr. Whitefield himself insisted that, given the ancestry and temper of the colonists, "the Catholic Church could never gain such a footing in this country as to actuate its bloody powers."[29]

---

[26] *Pennsylvania Journal*, November 9, 1774.

[27] Bernard, *Appeal*, p. 35.

[28] *Ibid.*, p. 36.

But once more it must be said that when fear preyed on the minds of men, when they believed that a Catholic thought he was doing a service to God if he sent a heretic "to the devil for the sake of his soul," arguments and appeals to reason or to a sense of justice were pure waste of time and effort. In a very literal sense Bernard, Johnson, and Seabury were voices crying out in the wilderness; those voices, if audible, fell on deaf ears and closed minds. The voluble and violent campaign against the Quebec Act and its religious provisions continued, growing in intensity and taking on new phases. Solomon Southwick and his *Newport Mercury* led the forefront with a venture into necromancy and a businesslike advertisement of Antonio Gavin's vile book. So alarmed were the inhabitants of Portsmouth that they seized the supplies in the fort so as to be ready for any emergency.[30] In New York public indignation was expressed and stimulated in an impressive manner. The raising of a union flag on the liberty pole was followed by a march to the Exchange, with two bearers carrying a huge flag inscribed on one side "George III Rex, and the Liberties of America. No Popery," and on the other "The Union of the Colonies, and the Measures of the Congress."[31] Later that same day a pamphlet which had censured the colonists and spoken in behalf of the Catholics of Canada was tarred and feathered and nailed to the pillory.[32] Such measures were an effective antidote to the arguments of Bernard, Seabury, and others. Channeled in this manner, hostility to the Catholic religion was intensified, for the common man understood this language; he was impressed, and confirmed in his fears. The colonists were, after all, largely Englishmen nursed from childhood on anti-Catholic prejudice.

---

[29] *Providence Gazette*, December 17, 1774.

[30] *New York Gazette and Weekly Mercury*, January 9, 1775.

So too a tale in the *Massachusetts Spy* was not above the comprehension of the least intelligent. A courier from General Gage in Boston to Governor Carleton in Canada, so ran the story, had been detected and apprehended. On his person was Gage's request that "his very good friends the Catholics may be henceforth sent to assist him in cutting the throats of all heretics."[33] Was not this confirmation of their fears and suspicions? Was it not literally true that an insidious plot was afoot to overthrow Protestantism and replace it by popery? Here was delinquency so great that it justified any measure, however extreme. Unless they were thwarted these enemies would introduce "the blind, bloody religion of Popery, which is founded in ignorance and superstition, and calculated to promote the present ruin, and eternal destruction of all that embrace it."[34] In like strain "Worcestriensis" memoralized the honorable legislature of Massachusetts Bay to the effect that the Roman Catholic religion was proscribed, not so much for being "a Farrago of monstrous absurdities and contradictions," but for its tenet "that to kill and destroy all who differ from them in religious sentiments is no crime."[35] Of like kidney was the individual who claimed that the "honest, undesigning endeavors" of Luther were God's instrument for effecting "his purpose of a glorious reformation in the church, and a total separation from the Whore of Babylon, of which Luther had not the remotest expectation."[36]

---

[31] *Pennsylvania Packet*, March 13, 1775. In recounting this event not a few writers omit the "No Popery" inscription.

[32] *New York Journal Supplement Extraordinary*, April 6, 1775.

[33] *Massachusetts Spy*, June 21, 1775.

[34] *New York Journal*, April 11, 1776.

To these excerpts from the colonial press scores upon scores of others of like tenor could be added, but those quoted should suffice to show that the Quebec Act was regarded as a capital grievance, and on what part of the act attention was chiefly focused. That the onslaught on the Catholic religion was pushed with vigor is equally patent. Historian David Ramsay did not exaggerate when he wrote that "the legal parliamentary right to a maintenance conferred on the clergy of the Roman Catholic religion gave great offence to many in New England."[37] Every extant issue of the *Newport Mercury* from October 3, 1774, to March 20, 1775, contains at least one invidious reference to the Catholic religion of the Canadians. Almost as aggressive were the *Massachusetts Spy* and the *Essex Gazette*, the latter climaxing its efforts with no less than six such animadversions on November 15, 1774.

But if the press of New England formed the advance guard, that of New York followed closely, and even in Pennsylvania and Maryland the press indulged in periodic censure and arraignment. It may be objected that, John Adams notwithstanding, doubtful value as an index of public opinion attaches to excerpts culled from the press. For one thing these contributions hid behind anonymity; they may have been people of no standing; and besides, a certain type of person is eager to see himself in print. But since pen names were commonplace, they are not a confession of insignificance; and some of these literary devices have been broken through, and behind them we find the redoubtable Sam Adams and other stalwarts. Moreover, but for the tacit approbation of editors, this sniping at the Catholic religion would have been stillborn. Solomon Southwick of the *Newport Mercury* and Isaiah Thomas of the *Massachusetts Spy* were enterprising editors who, with an eye to circulation, screened contributions and accepted only what in their estimation would be palatable to their readers. Had they anticipated resentment or sensed an undertone of disapproval of their policy, they would have called off the pursuit.

---

[35] *Massachusetts Spy*, August 21, 1776.

[36] *Constitutional Gazette*, May 8, 1776.

[37] David Ramsay, *History of the American Revolution*, Vol. 1, pp. 110-11. 2 vols. London, 1793; Charleston, 1809.

What must have been the thoughts of Catholics, of Charles Carroll and John Carroll for instance, as they read these attacks on the faith they cherished, saw their good faith impugned and themselves branded as the scum of humanity addicted to any enormity. Conscious as they were of the utter falsity of the charges and the deliberate distortion of facts, their first impulse may have been contempt for such disseminators of ill will. Living in an environment ever charged with suspicion and with either latent or open hostility, they had grounds for refraining, whenever possible, from all association with their Protestant neighbors, for it would have been embarrassing to enter into fellowship with people whose credulity accepted any wild accusation. That these men were not so embittered as to preclude all later cooperation is testimony to their spirit of forgiveness.

Even if one be inclined to doubt whether newspapers are a reliable gauge of public opinion, all doubt vanishes when the utterances of men of the cloth are considered. Not a few of the clergy actively collaborated with the press in inveighing against Catholics and Catholicism. Just how influential were the clergy in molding public opinion? Alice Baldwin's study of the subject led to the conclusion that their influence was not negligible.[38]

---

[38] Alice M. Baldwin, *The New England Clergy and the American Revolution.* Durham, 1928.

True, conditions had changed since the early days of the several colonies, and the inroads of deism and sectarianism had weakened the foundations of clericalism, even though a number of religious controversies had temporarily checked the drift. On the whole the ministers were still revered by the members of their flocks, with whom their opinions had weight; for the clergy were not a caste set apart but men of the people, who were always in closest contact with their parishioners. Through the medium of their pulpits they directed and influenced their flocks, and on special occasions, such as election day or the day for the drilling of the militia, they were able to reach a much wider audience. Elbridge Gerry advocated the use of the clergy for political ends.[39] Moreover, some ministers, through their connections with political figures, must have had an influence, far-reaching though subtle, that was of prime importance.[40] The clergy, then, comprised a group to be reckoned with; their influence was not to be denied.

That the New England ministers wielded power has been acknowledged by friend[41] and foe[42] and mild critic.[43] They were the choice of their flocks, whose thoughts and prejudices they shared. It is very unlikely that they would have retained their position if they had clashed with their flocks on major or highly controversial issues. All this adds up to the fact that they are a trustworthy index of public opinion. Their propensity for politics was noted and mildly censured by a patriot.[44] But an enemy, struck by the incompatibility of indulging in politics and attending to the recognized duties of their office, averred that instead of preaching meekness, sobriety, obedience, and fidelity to duty they "belch from the pulpit, liberty, independence," and formal disloyalty.[45] One controversialist dubbed these political-minded ministers of the gospel the "pulpit-drum ecclesiastics,"[46] while a more outspoken critic would label their sermons "Ecclesiastical Billingsgate." So notorious was the virulence of many of these preachers of the word of God, so common the custom of digressing from any topic into unrestrained denunciation of Catholics and their beliefs, that Reverend Jonathan Boucher could cry out that "Hardly a book or an article of religion has been written; hardly a sermon on any controversial point has . . . been preached; hardly a public debate or private conversation has been held on the subject of religion or politics in which . . . the parties have not contrived to have a thwack at Popery. We have exhibited them, as some of our enemies are wont to exhibit those they call heretics, in an auto-da-fe, in an horrid dress, disfigured with monsters and devils."[47] Himself an Episcopal clergyman well known in Virginia and Maryland, he marshaled arguments for toleration, and advocated the application of the principles of Christianity to papists as well as other Christians.[48] For his pains the "pulpit-drum ecclesiastics" and patriots with one accord fell upon him in bitter wrath.

---

[39] James T. Austin, *The Life and Contemporary Letters of Elbridge Gerry*, Vol. 1, pp. 18, 19. 2 vols. Boston, 1828.

[40] In Boston, Charles Chauncey of the First Church, Samuel Cooper of Brattle Street, and Jonathan Mayhew of the West Church were close friends of James Otis, of Samuel and John Adams, of John Hancock, and of others who spearheaded the opposition to British authority.

[41] John W. Thornton, *The Pulpit of the American Revolution*, Chap. 38. Boston, 1860.

[42] A Westchester Farmer [Samuel Seabury], *The Congress Canvassed*, p. 21. New York, 1774.

[43] Jonathan Boucher, *Reminiscences of an American Loyalist*, pp. 118-19. New York, 1925.

---

[44] "The clergy are always too busy in political matters; they ever have and ever will be so, where they fancy that the Kingdom of the Messiah wants to be strengthened and supported by the Laws of the Kingdoms of this world" (Doctor Benjamin Gale to Silas Deane, in *Connecticut Historical Society Collections*, Vol. 2, p. 203. [Hartford, 1870]).

[45] *Rivington's New York Gazeteer*, March 9, 1775.

[46] Farmer, *Congress Canvassed*, p. 21.

[47] Jonathan Boucher, *A View of the Causes and Consequences of the American Revolution*, p. 262. London, 1797.

[48] *Ibid.*, pp. 256, 263, 264.

Obviously, if in normal times the animosity of the clergy was so articulate, it would be sharpened by the Quebec Act, which tolerated in Canada the Catholicism they abhorred. That provision would be as gall and wormwood; it would prompt the stalwarts to instant action and drive them to new heights in denunciation. Even before the text of the Quebec Act was published, but when its tenor and content were already known, Ezra Stiles, later president of Yale College, committed to his diary his loathing over the establishment of "the Romish Church and IDOLATRY."[49] Recourse to capital letters bespeaks his utter abhorrence of that creed; it suggests that in his mind this provision outweighed the political arrangements as a menace. What particularly dismayed him was the connivance of "a whole Prot Parl." in such an outrage; could it be true that England's staunchly Protestant Parliament had approved this legislation? He gave vent to his anguish of spirit in a sermon, November 27, 1774, on the "Nature and the Danger of Popery in this Land, from the opera of the Quebec Bill for the Establishment of the Romish Religion over two thirds of the British Empire."[50] On another occasion he questioned whether the act would not entail the Quakers' suffering "greater persecution from Romanists than they ever received from Protestants."[51]

In like manner Reverend Samuel Sherwood of Fairfield electrified his audience with the awful tidings that they were threatened with deprivation of liberty of conscience and the liberty of "professing the important truths of the gospel."[52] Later he would cast reserve to the winds and label the "papist" religion a composite of "iniquity and absurdity," the leaven which had "adulterated and corrupted the Christian religion."[53]

---

[49] Stiles, *Literary Diary*, Vol. 1, p. 455.

[50] *Ibid.*, November 27, 1774, p. 490.

[51] *Ibid.*, p. 494.

[52] Samuel Sherwood, Fast Sermon, p. 37. New Haven, 1774.

[53] Samuel Sherwood, Address on the Times, p. 10. New York, 1776.

To him, moreover, papal Rome was "the great whore of Babylon" whose bewitching enticements seduced mankind and aroused their lust, so that they "have committed fornication with her, and the inhabitants of the earth have been made drunk with the wine of her fornication and whoredom."[54] Scarcely less extreme was Reverend John Lathrop of the Second Church in Boston, who held that Catholics "had disgraced humanity" and "crimsoned a great part of the world with innocent blood."[55] Finally, to cite but one more instance of this "Ecclesiastical Billingsgate," in addressing the Honorable Council and House of Representatives of Massachusetts Bay, Reverend Samuel West of Dartmouth insisted that the pope and his clergy must be "the second beast" of "Revelation," promoters of idolatry, false prophets.[56] The application of the passage (Revelation 13:11-17) to the pope he held most fitting. That the clergy could debase their pulpits with such language without fear of inciting resentment is a shocking revelation of the prevalence and depth of anti-Catholic feeling. Evidently clergy and laity were of one mind where Catholics and their religion was concerned.

If the clergy so conducted themselves, what about the laity? John Adams, the eulogist of the Dudleian lectures and self-constituted commentator on canon and feudal law, may be taken as typical. While attending the Continental Congress in Philadelphia he had a unique experience one Sunday afternoon. Induced by "curiosity and good company," as he informs his wife, he "strolled away to mother church, or rather to grandmother church. I mean the Romish chapel."[57] Never before had he been so daring. His reaction to what he saw and heard was mixed. On the one hand he was favorably impressed by the sermon on the duty of parents to their children; but his Puritan prejudices quickly prevailed. "This afternoon's entertainment was to me most awful and affecting," what with "poor wretches fingering their beads" and chanting in a language unintelligible to them. Their prayers, their bowing the head at the name of Jesus, their genuflections, kneelings, and signing themselves with the cross—all these he reprobated. Nothing escaped his observant and critical eye. The vestments of the officiating priest, the pulpit, the altar, the crucifix, candles, holy water, the music, and the picture of the crucifixion surmounting the altar held his attention, and it was with some difficulty that he resisted their charm. "Here is everything that can hold the eye, ear and imagination, everything which can charm and bewitch the simple and ignorant. I wonder Luther ever broke the spell."

---

[54] *Ibid.*, p. 11.

[55] John Lathrop, Thanksgiving Sermon, p. 31. Boston, 1774.

[56] Samuel West, Sermon before the Honorable Council and House of Representatives of Massachusetts Bay, p. 64. Boston, 1776.

[57] Adams, *Works*, Vol. 2, p. 395.

In this very personal letter Adams reveals his inner self, but his correspondence with James Warren discloses the same deep-seated aversion to everything Catholic. In one letter Adams rejoices that the few Roman Catholics in Braintree "dare not show themselves";[58] in another he subscribes to the current fantastic conception of Jesuits, not one of whom, it may readily be supposed, he had ever met in the flesh. "I admire the Jesuits," he says. "The science is so exquisite and there are such immense advantages in it (if it were not for the deviltry of it) most ardently to be wished. To see them bowing, smiling, cringing and seeming cordially friendly to persons whom they openly avowed their malice against two years ago, and whom they would gladly butcher now, is provoking yet diverting."[59] Adams, it must not be overlooked, prided himself on his broad-mindedness. Many years later, in a letter to Thomas Jefferson, Adams bewailed the fact that anyone should attribute to him "narrow thoughts, contracted sentiments, bigoted, enthusiastic or superstitious principles."[60] And yet in another letter to Jefferson he characterized Catholicity as "Platonic, Pythagoric, Hindoo and Cabalistic Christianity."[61] John Adams made no effort to conceal his views; they were no secret; the man in the street knew his mind.

---

[58] *Ibid.*, Vol. 9, p. 355.
[59] *Ibid.*, p. 337.

Another who was not inhibited from voicing his utter dislike of Catholics and their religion was the youthful Alexander Hamilton, at this date still an undergraduate at King's College. In a pamphlet entitled *A Full Vindication of the Measures of Congress*, a rejoiner to criticism of that body by "A Westchester Farmer," he touched indiscriminately on politics and religion. At one point, yielding to his emotions, he cried out: "Does not your blood run cold to think that an English parliament should pass an Act for the establishment of arbitrary power and Popery in such an extensive country? . . . Your lives, your property, your religion are all at stake. I do my duty. I warn you of your danger. If you shall still be so mad as to bring destruction on yourselves; if you should still neglect what you owe to God and man, you cannot plead ignorance in your excuse. Your conscience will reproach you for your folly; your children will curse you!"[62] Furthermore, the advantages guaranteed by the Quebec Act to the Catholic religion in this area would attract hordes of immigrants from the Catholic states of Europe to the practical exclusion of Protestants. In short, a Catholic region would come into being on their western frontier, with consequences terrible to contemplate. Like Adams, Hamilton cautioned all lovers of America not to dismiss his warnings as a mere outburst of bigotry and intolerance.

No less caustic was Judge William Henry Drayton of South Carolina. Early in November 1774, when he addressed the grand juries of Camden and Cheraw, he indulged in a gratuitous attack on the Catholic religion. Appealing to their regard for their ancestors and their sense of filial duty, Drayton urged them to risk everything to preserve intact their heritage received from their forefathers. One element of this heritage was "the sacred Christian religion, released from the absurdities which are inculcated, the shackles which are imposed, the tortures which are inflicted, and the fires which are lighted, blown up and fed with blood by the Roman Catholic doctrines which tend to establish a most cruel tyranny in Church and State—a tyranny under which all Europe groaned for many ages."[63] In due time this address was published, and then broadcast by the colonial press.[64] Again on April 23, 1776, while instructing the grand jury of Charleston, South Carolina, Drayton was no less bitter; and in October of the same year, when instructing the same grand jury, he again enkindled the fires of religious hatred. The response of these exhortations was such as Drayton anticipated.

---

[60] *Ibid.*, Vol. 10, p. 46.

[61] *Ibid.*, p. 100.

[62] *Ibid.*, Vol. 1, p. 39. 1904 edition.

In a desperate effort to deter his countrymen from the course of action on which they were embarked, Tory-minded Joseph Galloway advanced as a clinching argument the religious consequences entailed by success in severing ties with England. Only a miracle could save Americans from utter disaster. In the past "the horrors of popish superstition" had been averted by Britain's might. If independent, sooner of later America must fall a prey to a foreign power, and that power could be no other than France. In turn subjection to France would imply not only the suppression of their cherished political rights and liberties, but the abolition of their very religion and the substitution of the "bloody Superstition of Rome."[65] Finally, Philip Livingston, a distinguished citizen of New York, when about to take his seat in the Continental Congress held the selfsame views as Adams, Hamilton, Drayton, and Galloway. In "The Other Side of the Question" he asserted that the British ministry had espoused "all the bigotry all the superstition of the Church of Rome."

---

[63] Force, *American Archives*, fourth series, Vol. 1, p. 959.

[64] *Pennsylvania Journal*, January 28, 1775; *Massachusetts Spy*, February 16, 1775; *Newport Mercury*, February 6, 1775.

[65] Joseph Galloway, *A Candid Examination of the Mutual Claims of Great Britain and the Colonies*, p. 48. New York, 1775.

Thus eminent men in Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, and South Carolina, not to mention other communities, seized upon or created occasions to denounce the Catholic religion and to brand it as subversive and wicked. In bitterness and fury they rivaled the clergy. And since these utterances were broadcast by the press, they must have come under the eyes of Catholic readers, who were thus furnished conclusive proof of the abhorrence in which they and their creed were held by men of influence. Truly terrifying to Catholics in its implications was this stark reality.

Town assemblies were also listed by John Adams as indicating what men thought. Obviously it is quite impossible to canvass the countless town meetings and local assemblies of the thirteen colonies insofar as they appertain to our subject. Typical, however, is "The Votes and Proceedings of the Freeholders and Inhabitants of the Town of Boston,"[66] which palliates the exclusion of Catholics from mutual toleration because they hold subversive doctrines.

But one set of county resolutions, that of Suffolk County in Massachusetts, stands apart inasmuch as it won official and wholehearted approval from the Continental Congress. The Suffolk County Resolves of September 9, 1774, associate religion and politics. Article X reads: "That the late Act of Parliament for establishing the Roman Catholic religion and French laws in that extensive country now called Canada, is dangerous in an extreme degree to the Protestant religion, and to the civil rights and liberties of all Americans; and therefore as men and

---

[66] *The Votes and Proceedings of the Freeholders and Inhabitants of the Town of Boston*, p. 4. Boston, 1772.

Protestant Christians, we are indispensably obliged to take all proper measures for our security."[67] Observe that the threat to the Protestant religion is given priority over the threat to civil rights and liberties. Note too that the appeal is to men "as Protestant Christians."

The conduct of the Continental Congress in respect to the Catholic religion poses a major doubt as to the good faith of its members. On September 17, 1774, within two weeks of the opening session, Congress resolved unanimously and without the formality of debate, so it was charged,[68] to approve the Suffolk County Resolves. Given the composition of Congress, this was to have been expected; but late in October, Congress issued four public addresses of such a character that they laid Congress open to the charge of deliberate deceit and conscious bad faith, for the reason that, although only five days intervened between their issuance, they are plainly contradictory.

On October 21 Congress issued an "Address to the Inhabitants of the British Colonies" and another "to the People of Great Britain." The former, drafted by Richard Henry Lee, was for domestic consumption. It is an apology for the colonies, a justification of the measures adopted. It protests against the Quebec Act because, while mere toleration of the Roman Catholic religion was stipulated by the peace treaty, establishment has ensued. The "Address to the People of Great Britain," drafted by John Jay, Richard Henry Lee, and William Livingston, is more forthright. References to the Catholic religion are numerous and uniformly unfriendly in the extreme. That religion is said to be "fraught with sanguinary and impious tenets," while the Catholic Canadians are eager instruments for reducing the Protestant colonies to a slavery like their own. Moreover, in the Quebec Act, Parliament has countenanced a creed that has deluged England with blood and "disbursed impiety, bigotry, persecution, murder and rebellion through every part of the world."[69] Finally there is the prediction that, once America has been enslaved and made Catholic, Americans will be employed to reduce and enslave English Protestants.

---

[67] *Essex Gazette*, September 20, 1774.

[68] Thomas B. Chandler, *What Think Ye Of Congress Now?* p. 24. New York, 1775.

Only five days after Congress had thus stigmatized the religion of some thousands of the citizens of the country, it fixed its attention on Canada. The work of Thomas Cushing, Richard Henry Lee, and John Dickinson, the "Address to the Inhabitants of the Province of Quebec" was couched in most friendly terms. Congress blithely ignored the hard words of the very recent address to Englishmen, professed general regard for the Canadians, anxiety over the withholding of some of their newly acquired rights as British subjects, and a tolerance, almost a sympathy, for their religious belief. It argued that, since liberty of conscience is from God and a natural right of men, it was theirs long before it was guaranteed by the Quebec Act. Since divine ordinance bestowed it on them, human law could only add confirmation. But the Inquisition and *lettres de cachet* menaced the Canadians, and fundamental rights were denied them. Only in union with the colonies represented by Congress lay hope. Admittedly there were obstacles to such a coalition, but with good will they could be surmounted. Americans on their part were so impressed by the "liberty of sentiment" characteristic of Canadians that a difference in religion would not preclude cordial relations and close friendship. And, as the Swiss Cantons showed, lovers of liberty could rise "above all low-minded infirmities." The harmonious joining of Catholic and Protestant Cantons presaged equal success for a union between Catholic Canadians and Protestant Americans. As an earnest of its sincerity and of its eagerness to expedite this development, Congress professed to view every violation of the rights of Canadians as a violation of its own.

---

[69] *Journals of the Continental Congress*, Worthington C. Ford and Gaillard Hunt, editors, Vol. 1, pp. 83-88. 23 vols. Washington, 1904-1914.

Were these honeyed words a mere façade or the expression of a change of heart? It would appear that this seemingly benevolent attitude towards the religion of the Canadians could scarcely have been sincere, for that very same day Congress likewise petitioned the king and listed as a major grievance "the establishing of an absolute government and the Roman Catholic religion throughout the vast regions that border our westerly and northly boundaries of the free, protestant English settlements."[70] In plain language, at heart the Congress did not relish the prospect of the proximity of those who practiced the religion for which, earlier in the day, it had professed such a benign regard. Even if the grievances enumerated are many and varied, it is a fact that the religious issue is raised; and in concluding the petition Congress defied its foes to assign causes other than these as the bases of trouble between America and England.

The contradiction between these several official documents is amazing. To assure the Canadians that their creed was no serious obstacle to collaboration with the British colonies and then immediately to assail the king because he had agreed to the unimpeded practice of that religion is an inconsistency that defies explanation. Extenuation on the plea of lapse of memory, inadvertence, or change of mind is ruled out by the almost simultaneous approval of the two documents. This was talking and acting as the exigencies of political expediency and an unscrupulous statecraft seemed to dictate. The incompatibility was so patent that even the least observant must detect it. Congress had placed itself in a vulnerable position, and its critics made the best of their opportunity. They were jubilant.[71] Congress was accused of dissembling. The "Address to the Inhabitants of Quebec" was deeply and inveterately malignant inasmuch as it resorted to cajolery and every device to breed disaffection; it was a truly Jesuitical address,[72] "flagrant in treachery . . . a cajoliling two-faced document."[73]

---

[70] *Ibid.*, p. 117, October 26, 1774.

[71] "We have seen the three Addresses of your Congress, the first of which is directed to us, the next to you, and the last to His Majesty. And we wish that

These addresses inevitably came into the hands of Canadians, and they were quick to compare them. What could they conclude as to the real sentiments of Congress, as to the profession of good will? Obviously the blatant contradictions wrecked any possibility of association with a Congress so untrustworthy as to resort to such double-dealing. Furthermore, and even more pertinent to our study, what must have been the reflections of Catholics in the British colonies when the Congress, presumably representative of the people, officially indulged in such language and such tactics? In their perplexity and disappointment they must have concluded that no improvement in their status was possible while such men presided over the destinies of the people; they must have been confirmed in the fear that religious prejudice was so deep-rooted and so vigorous that their conduct could not modify or eradicate it; and they must have felt that their fortunes and their welfare must not be bound up with those of their neighbors, who looked upon the merest toleration as utterly unthinkable.

The indices of public opinion specified by John Adams reveal that invariably they were employed as vehicles for the fomenting of hostility to Catholics and their religion. At times

---

we had not seen their Address to the French Inhabitants of Quebec, because it flatters them, provided they adopt the projects of the Congress, with the protection of a religion which the Congress in their Address to us, say, is fraught with "Impiety, Bigotry, Persecution, Murder, Rebellion" and therefore complain of Parliament for protecting" (*The Address of the People of Great Britain to the Inhabitants of America*, p. 1. [London, 1775]).

[72] "Massachusettensis" [Daniel Leonard], *To the Inhabitants of Massachusetts*, p. 109. Boston, 1775.

[73] *Ibid.*, p. 113.

a genuine hatred inspired the spokesmen. No less effective a weapon against that creed and its adherents was "The Poets Corner," a regular feature in many newspapers. Here light verse and doggerel played a part. Occasionally more pretentious efforts at poetry and even at drama highlighted the crusade.[74] In like manner ballads and songs were pressed into service either in the original or as adaptations or parodies of popular melodies. No known instrument for influencing the people was overlooked. Wherever Catholics turned they found their religion caricatured or derided, themselves slandered and portrayed as utterly depraved and as enemies of the public good. Indignation was futile; protest equally so. If even the threat of danger common to all brought no alleviation of their lot, the future, with the prospect of living under a government, the guidance and supervision of which was entrusted to those who were assuming power, must have loomed forbidding and hopeless. Human endurance has its limits. Under the circumstances and under the spur of this incessant clamor against them, Catholics would not have been human if they had not resented such misrepresentation and calumny, and longed for opportunity to vindicate their honor and their belief. Cooperation with their detractors was all but ruled out, for unity in effort must be based upon a meeting of minds as a prelude to unity of wills.

---

[74] Such ambitious efforts were: *M'Fingal*, an epic poem, and *The Progress of Dullness* by Jonathan Trumbull (Philadelphia, 1776); the effusions of *Bob Jingle*, self-styled poet laureate of Congress (New York, 1774); *American Chronicles of the Times* by John Boyle (Philadelphia and Boston, 1775); *The American Aroused in a Cure for the Spleen or Amusement for a Winter's Evening* under the pen name Sir Roger de Coverley (Boston, 1775); *The Fall* of *British Tyranny or American Liberty Triumphant* by John Laycock (Philadelphia, 1775).

CHAPTER III

The Crest and the Ebb of the Tide

As tension mounted between England and her colonies in North America and war clouds lowered on the horizon, some colonial realists gave serious thought to the complexities of the domestic situation. It was evident that the measures of Congress did not meet with universal approval; some people were indifferent, others opposed what they regarded as insolent and intransigent defiance of king and Parliament. Criticism emanated from many quarters; it grew in volume, boldness, and bitterness. It was plain that, if negotiation failed and conflict ensued, Congress could not count on the support of all the people. Individuals and areas would soon be classified as Tory, and there were also embittered minorities whose sympathies were not beyond question. A divided people boded ill for the happy issue of an appeal to arms; and if Catholics should join those who were apathetic or those who were hostile on political grounds, the chances of failure were multiplied. Since a coalition of American Tories and Catholics would create so formidable a fifth column as to invite disaster, it must be averted.

For even a united America to challenge one of the foremost military powers of the time seemed as futile an act as that of a terrier baying at the moon, so great was the disparity between the strength of the parties. Geographically America was vulnerable;

politically the thirteen colonies were held together by ropes of sand. Her people were dispersed over many thousands of square miles; her cities and coasts were unguarded; her rivers and ports open to a naval power that boasted of its invincibility. America had no government other than one of doubtful legality, no diplomatic service, no currency, no credit; above all she had no army or navy, none of the sinews of war. For the present she had no allies, and but slight prospect of acquiring any; for on what score could Protestant America appeal to Catholic France or Spain? Moreover, would America swallow her pride and go begging to the courts of Catholic countries? And if she did so, what inducements could she offer to those whose nationality and religion had been bywords of hatred in America for generations? The ghosts of the past would haunt negotiations.

On the domestic scene Catholics were negligible except in Maryland and Pennsylvania, but even there they were not influential. Because of their central position and vulnerability these two were key colonies; their support was essential to success. Good sense, then, as well as good politics, dictated that the baiting of Catholics cease. At all costs they must be wooed at least into neutrality; the past must be undone in an effort to prevail on them to enter the patriot camp.

To counteract the baneful effects of its contradictory addresses Congress made renewed efforts to cultivate the good will of its northern neighbors, but to no avail because the Canadians had been disillusioned as to Americans' singleness of purpose in inviting their cooperation. Likewise in an open letter to the "Inhabitants of Quebec," George Washington lauded their generosity and bravery, their nobility of soul and their vision, and dwelt on the mutual happiness which union of the two peoples would generate.[1] Obligingly, however, he closed his eyes to some hard, unpleasant realities at home, and boasted that Americans did not judge men by their religion or ancestry and knew "no distinction . . . but such as slavery, corruption or arbitrary dominion may create."[2] For obvious reasons this hopeful attempt also failed as had the previous one.

---

[1] John Fitzpatrick, editor, *The Writings of George Washington*, Vol. 3, pp. 126-27. 39 vols. Washington, 1931-1944.

On the home front Washington was more effective. Never a bigot, always a man of foresight, he appreciated the absurdity and offensiveness of harassing Catholics and scoffing at their beliefs, and he was quick to implement his conviction that this was bad manners, equally bad religion, and the worst possible politics. Opportunity came to him on Pope Day. Naturally the enthusiasm enkindled in Boston affected the soldiers centered about the town, but in orders to the army the commander-in-chief branded the celebration as utter folly. Moreover, at this juncture it was most unseemly and unpardonable, for among the soldiers who had hurried to Boston's relief were Catholics from Maryland and Pennsylvania. The impropriety of the accustomed festivities was evident. The celebration was banned.

In the same spirit Washington combated the bigotry of Benedict Arnold, who, together with Montgomery, was to lead the ill-starred expedition into Canada. Arnold's propensity to anti-Catholic utterances was well known, and it threatened complications in Canada and eventual resentment among the Catholics of Maryland and Pennsylvania. In military orders that could not be flouted Arnold was muzzled; he was admonished that if "common prudence and a true Christian spirit, will lead us to look with compassion on their . . . errors," he must nevertheless be "very cautious of violating the rights of conscience in others, ever considering that God alone is the judge of the hearts of men, and to him only in this case are they answerable." Therefore not only was Arnold to mete out condign punishment for every infraction of these instructions, but he was to use his influence and authority to "protect and support the free exercise of the religion of the Country, and the undisturbed enjoyment of the rights of conscience in religious matters."[3] As Washington realized, untoward incidents in Canada would be divulged, and they would offend the Catholics there and at home when their support was sought and needed.

---

[2] *Ibid.*

Still another attempt to redeem the past was the mission to Canada and the inclusion of two Catholics in the delegation, Charles Carroll officially, and Father John Carroll unofficially, in the belief that as a priest he could win over the Catholic Canadians to the patriot cause, or at least neutralize them.

The drastic change in the demeanor of Congress had its origin in the desire to gain the recognition and if possible the open support of a major power. Fully conscious of America's weakness, Congress cast about for allies in the life-and-death struggle now pending. All efforts were focused on this objective. The best prospects were Canada, not yet fully Anglicized, or France, still smarting under the humiliation of 1763 and presumably awaiting a chance to retaliate and regain equality with Britain. The Declaration of Independence had dissolved all ties with England and postulated rank as a sovereign state. But the Declaration was not recognition by other nations, and until recognition was forthcoming the nasty and dangerous designation of rebel might attach to the new belligerents, with possibly tragic consequences. If French recognition and assistance were to be won, the caricaturing of her people, customs, and religion must cease, for to solicit recognition and aid in the form of men and money while simultaneously indulging in ridicule or denunciation was a most clumsy adaptation of means to an end. One needed no experience in diplomacy to perceive the impropriety and ineptitude of such procedure which invited failure.

---

[3] Force, *American Archives*, fourth series, Vol. 3, pp. 765-67.

Clio delights in associating strange bedfellows. Political exigencies make sport of consistency and a laughingstock of men and nations. In coupling Protestant America with Catholic France, despite the background of a century and more of rivalry and open conflict, history might furnish another instance of Clio's caprice. Before that union could be consummated the sensitiveness of French military and diplomatic units to open disregard for their nation and their creed must be alleviated, and measures to this end must be pursued. Due to the weakness of Congress, and because of the pre-eminence of the state governments, the central government at that time could not apply the pressures that are customary today, but Congress was not altogether powerless. And so, in response to the example of George Washington and the open currying of good will by Congress, newspaper attacks on Catholics dwindled in frequency; eventually they became largely a monopoly of the Tory press. At all times, however, there were unbending individuals who would brook no mellowing towards Catholics, no abetting of popery.

On this new policy of conciliation and tolerance the clergy divided. Some conformed with such promptitude and thoroughness that onlookers were astounded; while others, an overwhelming majority it appears, continued to ply their stock in trade and disseminate prejudice. The very fact that even in an emergency they refused to comply with the new policy of the government gives us an inkling of the ingrained character of their anti-Catholic sentiments. In the dilemma created by the divergence in attitude towards themselves Catholics were inclined to regard the new advocates of sweetness and light as suspect, for those who adhered to the traditional pattern seemed to be more trustworthy exponents of what men felt and believed. Collaboration with such people could scarcely be wholehearted, since full trust was impossible because of the past.

Moreover, the ready adaptation to circumstances of some outstanding clergymen must have perplexed the rank and file of

Catholics long inured to their harsh words and invective. Indeed, in some instances the abruptness and precision of their volte-face was little short of ludicrous. Brazenly ignoring their previous sermons and addresses which had dripped venom and hatred of the French, and by indirection of Catholics in general, they now became heralds of good will and advocates of something akin to affection. Naturally their glaring inconsistency was seized upon by Tories and others, who called them turncoats and trained on them a barrage of derision by simply contrasting their former and their present utterances.

In conformity with the new trend Reverend Philip Payson assured the Council and House of Representatives of Massachusetts Bay on May 27, 1778, that a parallel was to be found between the role of King Louis of France and that of King Cyrus. In each case the intervention in behalf of God's people was providential.[4] Strange words these in the very stronghold of Puritanism, where expressions of quite different tenor had echoed and re-echoed with monotonous regularity. The same similarity and providential intervention was recognized by Reverend John Murray.[5] Louis' benevolent regard for America was hailed; his religion, hitherto a stumbling block, evoked no denunciation from either preacher.

The acme, however, was attained by Reverend Samuel Cooper of Brattle Street Church in Boston. Because of his frenzied arraignment of the French and their religion before Governor Pownall in October 1759 he was notorious as a slayer of popery. And this reputation was sustained and enhanced in 1773 by his Dudleian lecture on "The Man of Sin" to the Harvard student body. Since then he had continued as an active crusader against popery, but now, of a sudden, he executed such an about-face as must have made men gape in utter wonderment. In reality he was engaged by Conrad Alexandre Gérard, minister plenipotentiary of Louis XVI, at an annual emolument of $1,000, to "employ his pen" in spreading good will towards papist France and fostering hatred and defiance of Protestant England.[6] How widely this financial arrangement was known is impossible to determine, but the change in attitude was too striking to escape observation. How explain the substitution of a new outlook and all that it implied? Catholics asked whether Cooper had seen the light. Above all, was he sincere in his protestation of tolerance? His critics replied with an emphatic no, and Catholics were more perplexed than ever. Were they the victims of an insidious plot, a boring-from-within policy?

---

[4] Philip Payson, A Sermon Preached before the Honorable Council and the House of Representatives of Massachusetts Bay, May 27, 1778, p. 30. Boston, 1778.

[5] John Murray, Nehemiah, or The Struggle for Liberty, p. 50. Newbury-Port, 1779.

The propriety of looking to the clergy as indicators of the religious climate at any juncture was obvious. Payson, Murray, and Cooper, whom we have cited, were not alone in their mellowing, but they were not typical of their profession; converts to the new understanding were as yet the exceptions, not the rule. The New England clergy stuck to their guns and continued to crusade against popery, notwithstanding the espousal of the patriot cause by the Catholics of Maryland and Pennsylvania and their springing to the defense of Boston. It mattered not that this might hinder the negotiating and later the implementing of the alliance with France, or that it might dampen the ardor of Catholics already enlisted, or become a deterrent to future enlistment. Let it jeopardize harmonious relations with the European ally; let it give birth in the minds of Catholic soldiers and sailors to doubt as to what benefit they would derive from their hardships and wounds, as to what amelioration of their lot could come to them and their families through the triumph of such adversaries. The heritage, compounded of old loyalties, old fears and prejudices, was sacrosanct; it must be treasured and perpetuated. The obligation to cry out against popery must transcend the demands of politics and the whisperings of expediency. These men cared little whether their pronouncements would reach the ears of civil authorities or their Catholic fellow citizens: they must resist the trend towards broadness of view and toleration; they must cry alarm as heretofore. Patriotism, they felt, did not postulate disloyalty to their religious beliefs or the acceptance of such novelties as toleration of papists.

---

[6] G. Adolph Koch, *Republican Religion*, p. 22. New York, 1933.

We may find difficulty in comprehending the fearsomeness that possessed their souls in respect to anything even remotely associated with the religion they abominated; we tend to dismiss it as fantastic, but to them danger was very real and imminent. Perhaps we may gauge the depth and force of their fears from the testimony of Samuel Breck[7] that his maternal grandmother refused to kiss him, and only reluctantly blessed him, when he left home for France after the peace of 1783. Such was the worthy lady's abhorrence of all association with papists. Equally as revealing, and more significant because of the standing of those involved, was the opposition to the establishment of a professorship of French at Yale College. Since few Americans could converse in French, interpreters were in demand for communicating with French diplomatic and military personnel, whose knowledge of English was limited. To meet the need why not offer instruction in that language, and what place was more suited than Yale, presided over by that champion of orthodoxy, Ezra Stiles? For some time, however, this common-sense solution of a pressing problem was balked by the misgivings of a trustee lest this chair be made the means of instilling popery into the institution. Only when assured by Stiles and others that every precaution would be taken against this awful eventuality was his assent forthcoming.[8] Even so he advocated a method by which the introduction of popery would be prevented.

---

[7] Samuel Breck, *Recollections of Samuel Breck*, edited by H. E. Scudder, p. 77. Philadelphia, 1877.

At any rate, the clergy did not slacken their crusade against Catholicism. Moreover, added incentives were found in the very presence of the papist French and of American papists in the armed forces of the nation. Unless guarded against, this might undermine the customary caution and bring on a relaxing in vigilance, with consequences dreadful to contemplate.

That the alliance with France, which raised American hope of victory, had little moderating effect on the clerical mind of New England is abundantly clear. At the very time that the Continental Congress was straining every nerve to arrange this alliance with Catholic France, Reverend Samuel West demonstrated that he was of the old school of thought vigorously opposed to any abating of opposition to popery, which he labeled "mystic Sodom." In a discourse at Plymouth on December 22, 1777, "In Grateful Memory of the First Landing of Our Pious New England Ancestors," he stated categorically that to exclude from their communion and fellowship persons of a different religious persuasion on that score alone was tantamount to opposition to Christ's interests. Then, in flagrant violation of this general principle and warming to his subject, he declared that his text, Isaiah 66:5, 9, applied to those "who profess christianity and yet live after the manner of the Gentiles."[9] When Scripture foretold that those who "sanctify and purify themselves in the gardens, behind one tree in the midst, eating swine's flesh, and the abominations and the mouse shall be consumed," was not this a prediction of the destruction of the Church of Rome? Did not the members of that Church profess to be Christians and yet indulge in the defilements and abominations of the gentiles? Indeed, they were styled gentiles in the eleventh chapter of revelation. After this bold venture into exegesis he braved another excursion into the field and emerged with the information that, since his text could not apply literally to the land of Israel, it must portend the "destruction of that mystic Sodom the church of Rome."[10] Still another attempt at exegesis yielded the assurance that "the church of Rome is mistic Edom,"[11] whose overthrow is plainly foretold; but before that consummation many Catholics will be converted to primitive Christianity—grace will triumph and "multitudes of this mystic Sodom shall be brought to the acknowledgment of the truth."[12] Truth will prevail.

---

[8] "In July 1778 Silas Deane congratulated Stiles on his appointment and took occasion to suggest the usefulness of French in business and social life. With true Yankee shrewdness he remarked that funds for a professor and library might be solicited from some of his noble and wealthy friends in France, but, on the score that the purest French was spoken in Geneva, he advised securing from that citadel of Calvinism a professor 'whose principles as well as manners could not fail of being agreeable' " ("Dean Papers," *Collections of the New York Historical Society*, Vol. 2, pp. 475-77. [5 vols. New York, 1887-1890]. Corroborated in Stiles, *Literary Diary*, Vol. 2, p. 297).

[9] Samuel West, Anniversary Sermon Preached at Plymouth, December 22, 1777, In Grateful Memory of the First Landing of Our Pious New England Ancestors, p. 66. Boston, 1778.

Rivaling West was John Tucker, whose Dudleian lecture in 1778 deprecated the folly of those who reject the "grosser corruptions of the Romish Church but embrace some of the smaller size as less hurtful, or more to their taste."[13] But John Clarke, ordained July 8, 1778, and now pastor of First Church in Boston, eclipsed all competitors in vehemence of language. While commenting on I Corinthians 10:15, he adverted to the seeming inconsistency involved in acceptance of the miracles recorded in the Old and New Testament and rejection of the miracles advanced by Catholics. Clarke found an escape from this predicament in the simple expedient of declaring that the miracles of Scripture differed to such a degree from those of Rome in respect to the persons involved, purposes, and attendant circumstances that, while the former must be accepted as genuine and the work of God, the latter should be rejected as legerdemain or as brazen misrepresentations and lies. The claim that in "modern Rome, the dead are raised, the deaf hear, the lame walk, devils are cast out, and the most astonishing cures are effected" Clarke repudiated by assuring his audience that miracles in Catholic countries were wrought "by the relics of some despicable vagabond, who was a burden to society whilst living, and who died a brute." And they were "done in a corner" on the most trivial occasions, and vouched for by persons "whose interest it was to keep up the farce." Besides, the Romish creed in its literal acceptance of the words "This is my body" discarded reason, dishonored Jesus Christ, misinterpreted revelation, and contravened common sense.[14]

---

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 76.

[11] *Ibid.*

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 75.

[13] John Tucker, The Validity of Presbyterian Orders, p. 6. Boston, 1778.

Of the same mind was James Dana, who harangued the General Assembly of Connecticut on May 13, 1779. Tyrannical rulers, so he held, working in collusion with tyrannical ecclesiastics, had drenched the earth with blood. Such connivance is the key to the enigma of the recent establishment of popery in Canada; for popery, ever associated with despotism, is antagonistic to freedom and the Protestant religion.[15] Possibly if our allies should come to realize the advantages of freedom, they will renounce their superstitions; otherwise popery will be introduced. For a moment sanity prevailed, and Dana stated that if a magistrate deny equality to citizens merely because of religion, he would be violating the principles of free government. Then in open disregard of the rule of conduct just enunciated, he girded himself for renewed onslaught on Rome. The emissaries of Rome were always noted for "sagacity, activity, patience, with attachment to her interests," but with these virtues they combine "sloth, luxury and effeminacy," and the "boundless ambition, pride, avarice and intolerant spirit of persecution" distinctive of the Romish Church. "Their character and their doom we collect from our Saviour."[16]

---

[14] Sermons of the Late John Clarke, Sermon 8, in *The Office of Reason in Religion*, pp. 96-97. Boston, 1779.

[15] James Dana, A Sermon before the General Assembly of Connecticut, May 13, 1779, p. 15. Hartford, 1779.

It would have been natural for Catholics to assume that three years of cooperation between the French and American forces and the steady devotion of the Catholics of Maryland and Pennsylvania should have mellowed even staunch Puritan divines and diminished their animus against Catholics' religious beliefs. Such contact and such devotion should have opened Puritans' eyes to the possibility that men so truly loyal could not subscribe to the awful doctrines imputed to them. But in this reasonable expectation Catholics were disappointed; for even after the news of the allied victory at Yorktown had been broadcast, Timothy Dwight did not refrain from sounding all the old alarms and running through the customary litany of misrepresentations. In a sermon at Northampton on November 28, 1781, at a service to commemorate the capture of Lord Cornwallis and his army, which should have been a paean of joy and panegyric of the victory achieved by united effort and the blood of Protestant and Catholic alike, he drifted off into a lugubrious disquisition on anti-Christ, whom he identified with the Romish Church. By distorting the second chapter of the second epistle to the Thessalonians into a warning against the Romish clergy and the papacy, and by identifying them with "the wicked one" and "the mystery of iniquity," Dwight sounded a discordant note most inappropriate to the occasion. To substantiate his charge he cited the misdeeds of popes and clergy: "They have seated themselves in the church, or temple of God: and shewed that they are God, by assuming powers, which belong only to God; the power, for instance, of making laws to bind the consciences of men; of pardoning sin; of forming religious establishments; of introducing new laws for the conduct and government of the church; or, in a word, the mighty powers, denoted by that comprehensive title: The supreme Head of the Church, which belongs only to the Lord Jesus Christ. They have gone even farther, and claimed a power, to which God himself never pretended, the power of indulging sin. They have exalted themselves over all that is called God, or is worshipped."[17] One small crumb of comfort he drew from the conviction that in the recent suppression of the Jesuits "the Romish church has lost the chief support of the Pope's power." He dealt a left-handed compliment to the Jesuits inasmuch as he insisted that this order was founded in the most "consummate policy"; it consisted of "men of first talents" devoted to the interests of the papacy, who rendered the papacy "more essential services than all the rest of the Romish clergy united."[18] It followed that the destruction of such an auxiliary was "the most fatal wound popery had received since the Reformation." He concluded with the observation that "the increase of knowledge hath unfolded the ridiculous nature of the popish ceremonial, the absurdity of the particular tenets of that church, their inconsistency in adopting the Bible in pretence, and not in reality; the ridiculous nature of religious establishments."[19]

---

[16] *Ibid.*, pp. 43-44.

It is most significant that the gross impropriety of such a polemic on the occasion of general rejoicing and of the gratuitous insult to patriotic Catholics never crossed Dwight's mind; or if it did that it was brushed aside and, as usual, he indulged his animus. Obviously such brazen disregard for good taste incriminated the preacher rather than his victims. For to outrage the memory of those Catholics who had made the supreme sacrifice for their country, and to affront the Catholics still under arms in the very hour of victory achieved by the efforts of all, bespeaks not only an obsession but a genuine mania. But to Catholics nevertheless it was disheartening in the extreme that even Yorktown gave them no surcease from travesty and defamation of themselves and their creed.

---

[17] Timothy Dwight, A Sermon Preached at Northampton on the twenty eighth of November 1781, pp. 27-28. Hartford, n.d.

[18] *Ibid.*, pp. 29-30.

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 31.

Shoulder to shoulder with the implacable Dwight stood Ezra Stiles, the battle-scarred veteran of many campaigns against popery. We have already had occasion to comment on his ardor and vigor in this pursuit. In November 1778 he became president of Yale College. In some respects Stiles' conduct is more reprehensible than that of others, for in his official capacity he had abundant opportunity to meet and converse with Catholic Frenchmen in diplomatic or military service. Among those whom he entertained were the Chevalier de la Luzerne and François de Barbé-Marbois.[20] Stiles' diary attests his amazement at the Frenchmen's physique, ocular refutation of the popular belief that they were puny, spindle-legged, and inferior to Englishmen; he marveled at their ability to converse in Latin and to discuss philosophical and theological problems. But fixing a blind eye on the way Catholics were treated in New England, he inquired about the Edict of Nantes and evinced proper solicitude for the Huguenots. In the alliance there was an opportunity to tap reliable sources of information on Catholic doctrine and practice. How ineffectual this association was in broadening Stiles' outlook was disclosed on June 15, 1780, when he lectured the student body on the "Twelve Capital Errors in the Church of Rome."[21] A real emotional and intellectual iron curtain hung between Catholicism and such divines as Dana, Clarke, Dwight, Stiles, and others whom the limitations of space forbid our considering. Regardless of evidence to the contrary Catholics must conform to the caricature nursed for generations. They must be idolaters; they could not be men of rectitude, patriotic citizens, true Christians.

---

[20] Academic honors were conferred on these men and other Frenchmen of high rank—Yale made Gérard a doctor of laws; Harvard held a reception for Luzerne, Marbois, and other notables and conferred a degree on Joseph de Valnais, consul of His Most Christian Majesty; the college in Philadelphia invited Luzerne to its commencement, and the eulogy associated with such occasions was not lacking.

Confirmation of Stiles' inability to enlarge his views and keep his obsession under control came on May 8, 1783, in a sermon before the governor and Assembly of Connecticut,[22] when his inconsistency was as glaring as ever. On the one hand he asserted that the example of "friendly cohabitation of all sects in America" may have ushered "moderation, lenity and justice" into European states.[23] With sublime disdain of capitals he said that to America's credit such largeness of view obtained that she "will embosom all the religious sects or denominations in christendom —presbyterians, church of England, unitas fratrum, the baptists, the friends, the lutherans, the romanists . . . the dutch, gallic and german reformed or calvanistic churches—westlians, mennonists, others."[24] But sooner or later the evil spirit of popery would be conjured up, and Stiles would proceed to exorcise or slay the demon. After crediting Americans with broad-mindedness, he promptly dissociated himself from this class by shouting that "the species of idolatry is indifferent, whether ancient or modern, that of the Druids or Zoraster, of the Brahmins or Romanists, that of the great Lama of Potola."[25] Such mental gyrations raise the question of the intellectual honesty of the man; at any rate they detract from his stature.

---

[21] Stiles, *Literary Diary*, Vol. 2, p. 437.

[22] Ezra Stiles, The United States Elevated to Glory and Honor. New Haven, 1783.

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 55.

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 54.

[25] *Ibid.*, p. 76.

Whatever the explanation, the laity seem to have been more successful in this period in refraining from public utterances objectionable to Catholics. One might argue that their religious convictions were never so profound as those of the clergy and that deism and indifferentism had made inroads into the ranks of the upper classes. But this argument is unconvincing because it overlooks the facts that in themselves neither deism nor indifferentism implied a spirit any less hostile to Catholicity and that in their abhorrence of popery John Adams and Sam Adams did not yield precedence to any clergyman. For one thing, the laity did not live in ivory towers; they were more aware of the need of self-restraint in their almost daily association with men of other faiths, and contact with Catholics may have undermined and destroyed some of their illusions and presuppositions. At all events there is a striking contrast between what they said earlier and what they said after the alliance brought Frenchmen in numbers to America. They seem to have accepted Frenchmen as they were, their religion included.

Sam Adams did not commit himself; he appears to have maintained a discreet silence. Jay, however, surprisingly confessed to Franklin that he now cherished a regard for France such as he could not have thought himself capable of ten years ago.[26] Livingston shouted enthusiastically, "Blessed be God and huzza for Louis XVI."[27] Patrick Henry mellowed to the extent of proclaiming the French a "praiseworthy nation";[28] Samuel Chase entertained sentiments identical with those of Livingston;[29] while Samuel Holten, in an outburst of enthusiasm, celebrated the first anniversary of independence by attending Christ Church in the morning, the Catholic church at noon to sing the *Te Deum*, and Dr. Duffield's meeting in the afternoon.[30] Someone may object that Holten's religious spree is only proof of his utter indifference in religious matters; but it is noteworthy that he did not exclude Catholic services as he would have done instinctively a decade earlier.

---

[26] Henry P. Johnston, editor, *The Correspondence and Public Papers of John Jay*, Vol. 1, p. 310. 4 vols. New York, 1890-1893.

[27] Sedgwick, *William Livingston*, p. 294.

[28] William Wirt Henry, *Patrick Henry: Life, Correspondence ahd Speeches*, Vol. 3, p. 105. 3 vols. New York, 1891.

[29] Edmund C. Burnett, editor, *Letters of the Members of the Continental Congress*, Vol. 3, p. 218. 8 vols. Washington, 1921-1938.

The case of John Adams rivets our attention. His erstwhile attitude towards popery was very definite, openly expressed, and well known. Now, it appears, some doubts crossed his mind as to his previous dogmatizing. At any rate his correspondence with his wife reveals a state of mind quite unusual. He tells her that while on a visit to the church of St. Denis in Paris he was shown some crucifixes which an ecclesiastic alleged to be "bits of the true cross"; instead of rejecting the claim as preposterous he commented modestly that "this may be so for anything I know."[31] But the most startling admission came when he moralized on services he had witnessed in the "cathedral" (!) at Brussels, and acknowledged that he might have been "rash and unreasonable" in "cursing the knavery of the priesthood and the brutal ignorance of the people." He could even bring himself to say that it was "as much virtue in them to adore, as in me to detest and despise."[32] How different these remarks from his comments on his first entry into a Catholic church in Philadelphia! John Adams never divested himself of a deep aversion to Catholics, but the incidents and words just considered testify to a modification of attitude to which Dwight and Stiles were utterly unequal.

Wholly unprecedented on the official level was the proclamation by Governor Greene of Rhode Island of a day of fasting, humiliation, and prayer that God bless America's ally.[33] And Massachusetts promptly did the same on two occasions.[34] In this they were following the pattern set by Congress. There is a touch of the ironic, almost of the ludicrous, in the sight of New Englanders engaged in penitential exercises and prayer for a papist French king. Catholics may have wondered whether such proclamations were only diplomatic protocol, or whether in the higher echelons of government sentiments more amicable than those of Dwight and Stiles prevailed. What did all this signify? Was a new era dawning? Which group was sincere, which should be trusted? Was either worthy of trust?

---

[30] *Ibid.*, Vol. 4, p. 297.

[31] Charles F. Adams, editor, *Familiar Letters of John Adams and His Wife Abigail during the Revolution*, pp. 355, 359. New York, 1875.

[32] Adams, *Works*, Vol. 3, pp. 267-68.

A ticklish situation was created when Congress was invited by the minister plenipotentiary of France to services in the new Catholic chapel in Philadelphia on the anniversary of America's independence. The service at high noon featured an address by the minister's chaplain and the singing of the *Te Deum.* Apparently a goodly number of the members of Congress and others gulped down any qualms they may have experienced and put in an appearance, for according to the Philadelphia press the president, the Council of State, civil and military officials, and most distinguished men and women of the city were present. After all, sermons and the singing of hymns were constituent parts of their own religious gatherings.

But a major crisis developed when Juan de Miralles, a Spanish agent, died at Washington's headquarters and de la Luzerne arranged a solemn funeral service in St. Mary's Church. Personal notes to the members of Congress advised them that "There will be a divine service for the rest of the soul of Don Juan de Miralles at 9 o'clock."[35] This was different. In this instance they were invited to assist at Mass, the very core of Catholic ritual, and moreover at a requiem Mass, which was doubly objectionable. Regarding attendance as a gesture required by protocol, not a few appeared, but others found themselves unequal to downing the strong liquor of undiluted Catholicism. Benjamin Rush, for example, "declined attending as not compatible with the principles of a Protestant." Oliver Ellsworth leaves us in doubt as to his course, but he wrote to Jonathan Trumbull about de Miralles' death and "a lasting requiem to his soul." Ebenezer Hazard, on the contrary, found cause for rejoicing over "the most striking instance of Catholicism" he had ever witnessed, for the gathering included "not only Papists but Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Quakers, etc. . . . the two chaplains of Congress." He enthused over "the minds of people so unfettered with the shackles of bigotry."[36] In sharp contrast Benedict Arnold, in an attempt to palliate his treason, chided the government he had betrayed, because of the "mean and profligate Congress at Mass for the soul of a Roman Catholic in Purgatory and participating in the rites of a Church against whose anti-Christian corruptions your pious ancestors would bear witness with their blood."[37] Arnold implied that by their presence some members had foresworn their Protestantism and had in effect become papists.

---

[33] *American Journal and General Advertiser*, April 15, 1779.

[34] *Continental Journal and Weekly Advertiser*, October 21, 1779.

[35] Martin I. J. Griffin, *Catholics and the American Revolution*, Vol. 1, p. 257. 3 vols. Ridley Park and Philadelphia, 1907-1911.

Thus the religious climate varied once the French were here. Clergymen such as Dwight and Stiles knew no abatement in the campaign against popery, which they now deemed a more imminent menace, but the men who headed the government were able to meet the demands of diplomacy and common courtesy. But it should be borne in mind that the exigencies of a state of war and the presence of French allies, not the native Catholics, brought about the change. Even so, the latter welcomed the improvement; but would it endure and embrace them in themselves?

---

[36] Koch, *Republican Religion*, p. 25.

[37] Griffin, *Catholics*, Vol. 1, p. 257.

It was inevitable that the Tories should seize the alliance, capitalize the partial toleration of popery attested by the presence of Congress at Mass, and label it apostasy to Protestantism as well as treason. They confronted the patriot leaders with their utterances of years gone by. Not that the Tories entertained more kindly feelings towards Catholics; but this was a strategem designed to confuse the public, confound the enemy and add to his discomfiture. The very arguments previously marshaled against popery and France were now revived and forced down the throats of the patriots. Recourse to every form of propaganda by Tories put the patriots on the defensive and compelled them to resort to a wide range of explanations to justify themselves and counter the diversified onslaught of the enemy.

In the forefront of the Tory attack was Charles Inglis, author of *Letters of Papinian*, a series of compositions directed generally to the public and personally to Henry Laurens, president of Congress, and to John Adams. With uncanny skill and evident delight Inglis quoted newspaper articles and sermons of yesteryear and accented the contradiction between them and the current effusions. Moreover, he highlighted the betrayal and apostasy; for "despite the opinion of some to the contrary, it is absolutely certain, that on the part of many the present is a *Religious War*, with self-styled patriots ranged on the side of the defenders of popery, in arms against all that their forefathers fought for."[38] This was supreme tragedy. At all costs such a catastrophe must be averted.

The Tory press, spearheaded by *Rivington's Gazette*, enjoyed a holiday. Unsparing in his attack, Rivington probed sensitive spots, tortured his opponents, and exulted in their suffering. He harked back to the erstwhile tactics of his adversaries and turned on them the very artillery they had trained on papists and Frenchmen, stressing meanwhile the likely fruits of the unholy alliance, such as a "Mass House" set up "in every corner" of the land.[39] Nothing, however trifling or lacking in foundation, was overlooked. He fabricated a communiqué from France, allegedly found on a French ship captured by the British, according to which "Dr. Franklin has abjured the protestant religion and is decorated with the order of the Holy Cross of Jerusalem."[40] He revealed that the Spanish fleet was bringing a cargo wonderfully adapted to the needs of the new Gallophiles and pro-papists.[41] Among his other strategems was pretending to quote from a diary such as would be written by a Bostonian ten years in the future when the full fruit of the alliance would be garnered. In so doing he painted a picture that should have terrified a staunch Puritan, for this account chronicled the functioning of the Inquisition, prohibition of the Bible in the vernacular, Sam Adams' public recantation of heresy and his imminent ordination to the priesthood, the replacement of the English language by the French, an *auto-da-fé*, the burning of a Quaker, the New Bastille in America, a salt tax, and the deportation of American youth to France for education in the Catholic faith and due submission to government.[42] Still other developments were exploited.

---

[38] [Charles Inglis], *The Letters of Papinian*, p. 78. Philadelphia, 1776.

---

[39] *Royal Gazette*, January 6, 1779.

[40] *Royal Gazette*, October 17, 1778. "This vessel, besides despatches, brought a considerable cargo consisting of the following articles, viz. Massbooks 50,000; Racks and wheels 200; Consecrated Wafers 3,000,000; Crucifixes 15,000; Rosaries 70,000; Wooden Shoes 200,000 . . ."

[41] "On the Spanish ships were: 50 tons of holy water for the use of the soldiers; 400 casks of consecrated oil for extreme unction; 10,000 cuts of various saints with brief accounts of the miracles wrought by their reliques and at their shrines; 20,000 hair shirts, cowls and scourges and hempen girdles for the use of the religious orders to be established immediately; 3,000 wheels, hooks, pincers, knives, shackles and fire brands for the use of the Inquisition in converting heretics; 10,000 copies of a treatise, entitled, Wholesome Reveries, or the Necessity of Extirpating Heretics; 1,000 bales of indulgences; 20,000 copies of the Pope's Bull for Absolution of the French and Spanish armies for the massacres, burning of hospitals, butchering of infants, rapes and other crimes and cruelties, committed in the reduction of Great Britain" (*Royal Gazette*, January 29, 1780).

[42] *Ibid.*, March 17, 1779.

Instinctively sensing the possibilities, Rivington fixed on Samuel Cooper as a special target for his barbs, and he pilloried him ferociously. This called for no art; the encounter was no contest. For merely by juxtaposing Cooper's former anti-French and anti-popery sermons and his current Sunday prayers for Louis XVI and his malediction of the whole British nation,[43] Rivington etched the inconsistency of the man and made his renegade character stand out in boldest relief. Stark disaster, a fate worse than death, said Rivington, awaited America because of the betrayal of her religious trust by men such as Cooper, who were now prepared to be friends of popery, perhaps even embrace it, if it furthered their nefarious schemes. Rivington was aware of the efficacy of anti-Catholic propaganda in its various forms and he utilized it to full advantage. Catholics now found themselves in the anomalous position of being scorned by some patriots and by Tories and wooed by patriots in high office for reasons of state policy. Could either party win adherence?

We have reviewed the experiences of Catholics, first in colonial times, then on the eve of the Revolution, when the Quebec Act precipitated an outburst against them and their religious beliefs, and finally during the war years. All in all it is a sorry story, in conformity with the spirit of the times perhaps, but sorry nevertheless. In retrospect Catholics could recall open disregard, at times real persecution, in nearly every colony; for the present their plight was better because of circumstances extraneous to their creed; in prospect lay uncertainty as to their eventual status and fate. Estranged, perhaps somewhat embittered, they knew no reason for gratitude except in the Quaker dominion of Pennsylvania, no incentive to espouse the cause now officially accorded national acceptance by Congress. Moreover, was Congress the friend it pretended to be? Should Catholics put faith in it? It was the present plight that drove Congress to placate the Catholic body in order to attach it to the patriot cause. Political exigency, not a grudging acceptance of the principle of toleration, was the key to the situation. That need would pass. Would Congress then revert to its erstwhile attitude, so that in the long run there would be no betterment of the lot of Catholics?—for it must be remembered that not a few members of Congress had qualified as redoubtable opponents of "popery." If independence were ultimately achieved and political necessity terminated, would these men continue their present benevolence or would they take steps to restore the *status quo ante*?

---

[43] *Ibid.*, July 1, 1778.

Circumstances ruled out neutrality for Catholics. A choice was imperative. Delay would only defer the inevitable decision. On the one hand the recent Quebec Act indicated an appreciation of realities by a parliament which acted freely; on the other there was an unbroken record of hostility interrupted only by the temporary exigencies of war. Which side should Catholics espouse? Indeed the choice was not simple or easy.

This concludes our general study of the religious background of the American Revolution as it affected the Catholic colonists. That both Maryland and Pennsylvania merit special consideration is obvious. Justification for so extended a survey we found in the fact that no proper appraisal of either the magnitude or difficulty of the problem confronting the Catholics is possible unless it be based on a grasp of the record sketched in these three chapters. We must know the background in detail; we must avoid the pitfall of judging by standards that did not apply at the time. To do otherwise would ignore the complexity of the problem and underrate the risks inherent in any choice by Catholics.

CHAPTER IV

Maryland before 1776

One of the motives that prompted the Calverts to found their colony of Maryland was the desire to provide an asylum for the Catholics of England, where the penal laws of Elizabeth and James were still operative. That the wish to create a refuge where those who professed the faith introduced into England by St. Augustine might assemble, free from apprehension and molestation, was not Lord Baltimore's sole motive is quite true, but this fact does not detract from his credit. Much has been written about Lord Baltimore as a pioneer in religious toleration, and controversy has continued as to whether the distinction of priority in establishing religious toleration in America should be accorded to Maryland or to Rhode Island, but this issue is beyond the scope of our inquiry.

The seventeenth century, as we have already marked in the first chapter, was not a tolerant age. And this spirit, so prevalent in England, was transplanted and fostered in the colonies founded by Englishmen in America. Witness the spirit that prevailed in Plymouth and Boston, where ministers of religion and civil officials were ever on the alert to exclude all who might introduce heterodoxy and contaminate the pure gospel. It may be argued that, given the circumstances and the religious climate in the Old and in the New World, Lord Baltimore had toleration forced upon him; it would have been most inexpedient, even fatal to his scheme, to assume an unfriendly attitude towards the Established Church or even towards Dissenters. Fully aware of this fact, Lord Baltimore was statesman enough not to conjure up additional obstacles to the success of his venture in America; and so, from the inception of the colony, toleration was the watchword—toleration not only in principle but in practice.

The first settlers to leave England under Calvert's auspices for Maryland were mixed in religious creed, some of them Protestants, some Catholics. Since the long and wearisome voyage would try men's nerves, religious controversy might arouse discord and thus thwart the intentions of the proprietor. To forestall such an eventuality Cecil Calvert, the second Lord Baltimore, issued instructions which enjoined Catholics to refrain from all "scandall" and offense to Protestants. They were to practice their faith "as privately as may be," and to maintain "silence upon all occasions of discourse concerning matters of Religion"—demands which called for forebearance and restraint. Moreover, these injunctions were to be observed after landing no less than on shipboard, and the governor and commissioners were admonished to cultivate unity and peace.

With the details of the fortunes of the new colony at St. Mary's we are not concerned. Suffice it to say that Calvert's program was further buttressed in 1649 by the famous Toleration Act, which opened the settlement to all Trinitarians and to all believers in the divinity of Jesus Christ.[1] Furthermore, it was decreed that a fine of five pounds for the first offense should be imposed upon all who "utter any reproachful words or speeches concerning the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Mother of our Saviour, or the holy Apostles or Evangelists." For a second offense the penalty was ten pounds, for a third forfeiture of all goods and expulsion from the province. And since religious controversy was apt to ensue from insulting language or epithets, it was also enacted that no one might call another "an Heretick, Schismatick, Idolater, Puritan, Presbyterian, Independent, Popish Priest, Jesuit, Jesuited Papist, Lutheran, Calvinist, Anabaptist, Brownist, Antinomiam, Barrowist, Roundhead, Separatist, or other name or terme in a reproachful manner relating to matter of Religion."[2] The penalty for disregard of this regulation was a fine of ten shillings, and in the case the offender possessed no goods or chattles, whipping and incarceration "without Bayle or Mainprice" until by a public plea for forgiveness amends had been made to the aggrieved party. In these ways Lord Baltimore strove to establish and preserve religious harmony and toleration in his province.

---

[1] Clayton C. Hall, editor, *Narratives of Early Maryland*, p. 269 ff. New York, 1910.

For a short while Maryland throve as a haven for the victims of religious persecution. Invitation to come to Maryland was extended to Puritans in New England and in Virginia. The former turned a deaf ear to the proposal; but the latter, smarting under harassment by Governor Berkeley and the government of Virginia, sought shelter in the adjacent province where they were welcomed. Unfortunately the civil war in England between King Charles I and Parliament, which led to the defeat and execution of the king and the substitution of Puritan dominance for royal authority, had its repercussions even in distant Maryland. Shortly after their coming to the province Puritans had been graciously admitted to the government, but this did not satisfy Puritan zealots. Emboldened by the turn of events in England and availing themselves of the opportunity to overthrow the proprietary government and inaugurate rule by Cromwell's partisans, they turned on their hosts, annulled the benign legislation on religion which had so redounded to Maryland's credit, and by a series of statutory restrictions and disabilities disfranchised and hounded the very people who had befriended them so recently in their own hour of distress. In their inordinate zeal the Puritan assembly passed the most severe anti-Catholic legislation known to America. Among other abridgments of freedom they forbade the erection of Catholic churches and restricted Catholic services to private houses and chapels; they banned the employment of Catholic teachers; they confiscated the property of the Jesuits and expelled them; they disfranchised all Catholics and excluded them from office. From this welter of restrictive legislation Catholics emerged as second-rate citizens, dispossessed of religious freedom and political rights in the very province they had founded and developed. The edifice of religious freedom and toleration set up by the Calverts was razed. This unhappy episode of the Puritan ascendancy in Maryland has called forth severe and well-merited censure.

---

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 271.

The transition from the Protectorate to the Stuart Restoration in England did not mark a return to the traditional sanity of religious toleration in Maryland, for the Puritan innovations and mentality survived the change. Catholics continued to be penalized because of their faith; together with infidels and Jews they were barred from suffrage and officeholding; but as Jews and infidels were few and Catholics were numerous, it was upon the Catholics that the full brunt of the penalty fell. Among their major grievances were the imposition of a tax to support a religion they regarded as heretical and a government from which they were excluded, and the prohibition of public worship. Their woes multiplied and reached a peak when in the second decade of the eighteenth century the Maryland Council issued an order to remove children "from the pernicious contact of Catholic parents," and the lands of Catholics were made liable to double assessment when the province needed additional funds. Such wanton violation of the rights of parents and infringement of the right of private property because of religious convictions must have galled the Catholics whose ancestors had undertaken the founding of the province. In retrospect the charity which had opened the door to victims of religious oppression elsewhere must have appeared a grievous error. They must have felt like one who is shackled and imprisoned by those recently befriended; but they were powerless to effect a change. Time might come to their rescue, for time is an effective solvent for soothing asperities and rectifying injustices. At least, time might mitigate the severity of the penal laws inasmuch as it might awaken officials to a sense of the injustice inflicted on Catholics, or else a need for Catholic support of a cause might induce a relaxing in enforcement.

But the process of rectifying Catholic grievances would be slow, for prejudice was deep-rooted and hardy. Actually the obnoxious statutes respecting the franchise and officeholding would continue to be the law of the province till the very eve of the Declaration of Independence. Indeed, the eventual discrediting of the old intolerant spirit towards Catholics has been ascribed to the need for unity in opposing the mother country. As events moved towards the American Revolution efforts were made to placate and win over this very considerable element of the population, and concessions were made, often so grudgingly as to rob them of all graciousness. Political necessity or expediency knows an urgency which may not be denied; it has a strange facility for ignoring the past.

Actually, however, the American Revolution was still in the womb of the future; a generation and more would pass before that conflict. For the present, anti-Catholic sentiment held sway, and it cropped up again and again. For example, in May 1744 the will of Philip Lee, styled a gentleman of Prince George County, devised some property to his wife "during life if she remains a Protestant," and added other property "for 15 years if she remains a Protestant."[3] If on the one hand these precautions to forestall the spiritual defection of his wife bespeak Lee's intensity of conviction in the correctness of his own creed, they also attest his deep-rooted aversion to Catholicism.

---

[3] Maryland Historical Society—R.T. Semmes Genealogical Collection 20. Will Book #23 Liber D. Do. #2. 1743-1744. Folio 480.

Of greater significance, because it was the act of the whole elected Assembly and not that of an individual, was the supply bill of May 1756, which mirrored the animus engendered by the French and Indian War. In addition to taxing some of the proprietors' sources of revenue and levying a graduated assessment on bachelors, it imposed a double tax on Catholics.[4] Such gross injustice calls for no comment. Moreover, as the Church of England was now the established church of the province, Catholics and all persons of every faith or of no faith were assessed for its support. Truly the decay of anti-Catholic sentiment was slow; the inviolable rights of their fellow subjects were persistently denied to those who adhered to the old faith, even in Calvert's Maryland.

This has been designated the worst period of anti-Catholicism in the eighteenth century in England's American colonies. One might raise the issue whether the reaction to the Quebec Act was not more widespread, more unreasonable, and more acrimonious. At any rate so deliberate, open, and official had the harassing of Catholics become in Maryland that all avenues of redress seemed closed, all hope of betterment of their lot mere indulging in wishful thinking. Embittered by such discrimination and injustice and driven to near despondency by the prospect of what the future held for them and their families, some debated whether they should seek a solution in disposing of their possessions and withdrawing as far as possible from the jurisdiction of Maryland, by retiring to French or Spanish territory in the West Indies or beyond the Mississippi. In pursuance of this idea Charles Carroll, the father of Carrollton, began negotiations in 1757 with the French court with a view to securing a grant of land on the Arkansas River in Old Louisiana or in Louisiana itself.[5] Fortunately for the United States the project never reached realization, and thus the country was not denied the services of Charles Carroll.

---

[4] Matthew Page Andrews, *The History of Maryland: Province and State*, p. 260. Garden City, 1929.

Elsewhere we discuss in detail the number of Catholics in Maryland and their ratio to the total population; suffice it to say here that Thomas Burnaby, usually a close observer and reliable witness, assigns them equality in number.[6] Here and there they may even have outnumbered the adherents of the Established Church. Arthur Hall, Anglican rector of a parish in St. Mary's County, informed the bishop of London that "Catholics were three to one against him." If this be true, it must have described a local situation rather than the province as a whole.[7] Whatever their number, Catholics nursed the grievance of supporting a church to which they were strangers. They were legally denied all opportunity for education in their own schools; for them the alternative was illiteracy or attendance at schools where their creed was maligned and held up to ridicule.[8]

To this environment, always unsympathetic and often hostile to Catholics, there was applied an antidote from an unexpected quarter. Victims of a war in which they wished to have no part whatever, the French Acadians, after being ruthlessly uprooted from their homes and robbed of their possessions, were scattered in the coastal towns of the British continental colonies. A quite small contingent of these refugees was thrust ashore at Baltimore the very year of the penal legislation discussed above; and the citizens, touched by the sight of these forlorn and wretched people, for the time being forgot their traditional hostility to Frenchmen and Catholics and received them hospitably. Private homes were thrown open to a number, while others were temporarily lodged in a building nearing completion. Thus another racial element was added to Baltimore's growing population, and such names as Guttro, Blane, Gould, Dashield, and Berbine, among others, found a place. Deeply religious, the Acadians promptly opened a chapel, although they lacked a resident priest; frugal, industrious, and home-loving, they soon built simple dwellings on South Charles Street near Lombard, a quarter long designated French town. Reduced to penury by sudden expulsion from their homes and loathe to being public charges, they quickly turned to the task of eking out a living. A few took to navigation, while the aged and infirm picked oakum.[9] Theirs was a very wretched lot. Handicapped by a strange language, stubbornly attached to their French ways, and bewildered by a new environment, they became clannish, resisted the adoption of English customs, and thus retarded assimilation into the community. Obviously, even though they were few in number, they added to the small Catholic population of Baltimore; but for the present contacts between them and the English-speaking Catholics were limited, and for the reasons just cited, lacking in warmth.

---

[5] Guilday, *John Carroll*, pp. 152-53.

[6] Thomas Burnaby, *Travels through the Interior Parts of North America*, p. 84. New York, 1902; Boston, 1923.

[7] Charles A. Barker, *The Background of the Revolution in Maryland*, p. 43 note. New Haven, 1940.

[8] James Haltigan, *The Irish in the American Revolution*, p. 23. Washington, 1908.

Some fourteen years later the congregation had outgrown the small chapel, and as a common enterprise all Catholic groups planned to construct a new church. There was still no resident pastor; there would be none for another decade. The Acadians and some Irish Catholics, chief among whom were Patrick Bennet, Robert Walsh, and William Stenson, pooled their meager resources.[10] From Charles Carroll they secured a lot at Saratoga and Charles Streets, and they began the building of a plain brick edifice only twenty-five feet by thirty feet in dimension, to be known as St. Peter's.[11] To finance the project it was necessary to borrow. The supervision of the construction was entrusted to John McNabb, who found himself a bankrupt before the structure was finished, whereupon the principal creditor instituted a "suit against Ganganelli, Pope of Rome,"[12] to recover the funds he had advanced to McNabb, the superintendent of construction. When this strategy failed of the intended result, he locked the unfinished building and retained possession of the key for some years till the church was opened under dramatic circumstances. Thus for the time the Catholics had no adequate place for services.[13]

---

[9] J. Thomas Scharf, *Chronicles of Baltimore*, pp. 51-52. Baltimore, 1874.

[10] Thomas W. Griffith, *Annals of Baltimore*, p. 47. Baltimore, 1824.

Moreover, as no Catholic priest resided nearer than Carroll's manor of Doughoregan, some fifteen miles distant, the Baltimore congregation, if such it may be called, could assist at Mass only when Carroll's chaplain came to town. Once a month Reverend John Ashton, S.J., ministered to the small group in a room of Mr. Fottrell's house prepared for the occasion, but the language barrier precluded the proper instruction of the French element. Attendance varied from a minimum of twenty to a maximum of forty worshipers. Irregularity of service did not foster devotion, and the failure of the two groups to fuse into a unit begot disunion. As late as 1781 Abbé Robin found the French aloof, querulous, and disgruntled; they were disinclined to adjust themselves to their surroundings; stubbornly they persisted in regarding the customs of Acadia as the norm of propriety and excellence; and they indulged in criticism of the English-speaking priests, whom they accused of neglect and of lack of zeal and affection.[14] And the following year Claude Blanchard testified that they clung tenaciously to their vernacular and eschewed the English language.[15]

---

[11] Scharf, *Baltimore*, p. 66.

[12] Griffith, *Baltimore*, p. 47.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 66.

[14] Claude Robin, *New Travels through North America*, translated by Philip Freneau, p. 49. Philadelphia, 1783.

But the benevolence accorded the Acadians derived from humanitarian sympathy; it marked no substantial change of attitude towards their creed. An undercurrent of fanatical opposition came to the surface in 1774, when, with the laws proscribing Catholic teachers still extant, a Baltimore mob broke up John Heffernan's school and forced his departure.[16] Here, as in the province at large, the penal laws hung as a menace over the Catholics; at any time these laws might be resurrected and enforced with dire consequences.

And it was not only the lowly who were haunted by this specter. No station in life, no degree of wealth or education, guaranteed immunity or full acceptance of a Catholic by the community. This was the experience of so distinguished a citizen of Maryland as Charles Carroll of Carrollton. Upon the refusal of the Assembly to re-enact a law providing fees for the Episcopal Church, Governor Eden issued a proclamation by which he arbitrarily extended the Fee Bill. The result was open cleavage, with the Episcopal clergy and government officials arrayed against the Assembly and all nonconformist people. Hitherto Daniel Dulany, the secretary of the province, had enjoyed such popularity that he was hailed the "Pitt of Maryland," but in this crisis he elected to employ his pen in defense of government policy. His defection deprived the people of their champion. Who would be their new spokesman, the exponent of their ideas, the defender of their rights? In the emergency Charles Carroll took up the cudgels in defense of the rights of the people against the exercise of arbitrary power by the administration. Because he was convinced that he echoed the sentiments of the Assembly and of all non-Anglicans, he was not daunted by the ability or reputation of his antagonist.

---

[15] Claude Blanchard, *The Journal of Claude Blanchard, 1780-1783*, edited by Thomas Balch and translated by William Duane, p. 171. Albany, 1876.

[16] Thomas W. Griffith, *Sketches of the Early History of Maryland*, p. 62. Baltimore, 1821.

In his first contribution to the *Maryland Gazette* in January 1773 Dulany, under the pen name of "Antilon" or "Antillon," presented a dialogue between "First Citizen" and "Second Citizen," the latter defending the proclamation, the former assailing it. The discussion was so manipulated as to lead to complete defeat for the assailant. To the surprise of Dulany, who anticipated easy victory, Charles Carroll in the disguise of "First Citizen" entered the controversy. An exchange of four letters ensued, during which the identity of "First Citizen" was divulged. Worsted in the encounter, Dulany attempted to shift the discussion from a political to a religious basis and substituted invective and personalities for argument. He enlarged on Carroll's political disqualification; he reproached him for his limited citizenship; he taunted him with being a Jesuit; he dismissed him as a "nurseling of St. Omer's." Finally, Carroll was beneath consideration because "he is not a Protestant."[17] Though stung by these reproaches and cavalier tactics, Carroll maintained remarkable restraint. While admitting denial of suffrage and exclusion from office because of his religion, he argued that such limitations did not preclude thinking or writing on political issues. "We remember and we forgive," he declared. Resentment over such treatment had long since subsided, but measures such as his opponent resorted to in hinting at the enforcement of the penal laws either indicated latent malice or argued despair born of impending defeat. As the controversy raged Carroll was accepted as the spokesman of Dissenters as well as of Catholics; all rallied to his support. His victory was overwhelming. Overnight, as it were, he became the champion of the people, their bulwark against arbitrary government and the oppression of religious minorities. He was vindicated in the subsequent election of Matthias Hammond and William Paca, the candidates of the people, who in their exuberance over their victory formed a funeral cortege and escorted the proclamation to the gallows where, to the accompaniment of drums and firearms, the obnoxious measure was consigned to oblivion. Thus the appeal to bigotry by one of the most influential citizens of the province was frustrated, and it terminated in a fiasco because in this instance the interests of Catholics were identical with those of all who were not members of the Established Church. But again it was the individual who was acclaimed; it was a personal triumph for Carroll; acceptance and recognition by the public in themselves denoted no change in the attitude towards his faith. Outwardly a calm prevailed; but this calm would soon be broken, for public opinion is as unstable, as whimsical, as the weather.[18] Eventually "Daniel Dulany, Lloyd Dulany, and Daniel Dulany, son of Walter, all took active part in the loyalist cause."[19]

---

[17] "After all who is man that calls himself a Citizen—? Who is he? He has no share in the legislature, as a member of any branch, he is incapable of being a member; he is disabled from giving a vote in the choice of representatives, by the laws and constitution of the country, on account of his principles, which are distrusted by those laws. He is disabled by an express resolve, from interfering with the election of members, on the same account. He is not a Protestant" (Antilon in *Maryland Gazette*, April 8, 1773).

In 1774 or 1775 there occurred the dramatic opening of the unfinished St. Peter's Church closed in 1770 by an irate creditor. A military group, referred to variously as the "town guard," the "militia," or the "volunteer company," under Captain William Galbraith was assigned to the tasks of guarding some Scottish malcontents brought from North Carolina and of repelling anticipated incursions by Lord Dunmore, the loyalist governor of

---

[18] "The Scotch and Irish people there [Chesapeake Bay] are hand in hand with us, and very spirited. We do not expect much aid from Annapolis, as most of the able people there (except the Carrolls) are creatures, tools of government and Tories; many of which are already fled to your desperate land for safety; particularly three of the Dulanys" (Willard, *Letters*, p. 232).

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 233 note.

Virginia. One Sunday some of the soldiers sought permission to go to church. With the granting of their request the majority decided in favor of Catholic services, but to their chagrin they learned that the "church was closed and in the possession of Mr. P———." Undeterred by this fact, the company, under Captain Galbraith, marched to that worthy's residence and demanded the key of the church; and as Mr. P——— was already under suspicion of being disaffected to the patriotic cause, he deemed it unwise to offer resistance. To forestall further inquiry into his sentiments by the military and to escape additional disfavor, he promptly surrendered the key to Captain Galbraith and his men. Thus, successful in their quest, the company marched away, opened the church, and in the quaint language of the chronicler they "satisfied their devotion."[20] As the Tory sympathizer never reclaimed the key, it remained in the hands of the Catholics till the end of the Revolution, and thus at last they had a somewhat suitable place for worship. It should be noted that among these volunteers there were Catholics; more remarkable still is the fact that in a mixed group the officer appears to have been of that faith.

The Quebec Act of 1774, as we have shown elsewhere,[21] evoked an appalling outburst of protest in the seaboard colonies. The press, the pulpit, literature, song—in short, every agency of propaganda—were mustered to awaken and intensify hatred of this statesmanlike legislation. The English language was beggared to express and stimulate disapprobation; the most extreme allegations were lodged against Catholics and their creed. In not a few instances the campaign bordered on frenzy. While the critics disapproved of every stipulation of the act, it was chiefly on toleration of Catholicism that they fixed their attention. This they denounced and distorted into an official establishment of popery in the enlarged Canada—harbinger, some said, of a like recognition and establishment to be imposed eventually on Britain's English Protestant colonists. If New England, especially Massachusetts and Rhode Island, led the assault and proved themselves tireless in reviving old charges and ingenious in devising new ones, Maryland was not silent; the voices of some of her children swelled the chorus of denunciation.

---

[20] Scharf, *Baltimore*, pp. 66-67; Griffith, *Baltimore*, p. 47.
[21] Metzger, *Quebec Act*.

Indeed, so virulent was the onslaught on Catholics and their belief, to such a degree did it transgress the bounds of decency and charity, that it evoked protest from sober-minded individuals. Outstanding among them was Reverend Jonathan Boucher, personal friend of George Washington, tutor of his stepson John Parke Curtis, and Anglican minister of Queen Anne's Parish, Prince George County, Maryland. In his memorable sermon "On Toleration of Papists"[22] delivered to his congregation he painted a picture of religious conditions, and drawing on his own experience and observation, he enumerated the misfortunes of Catholics and marshaled arguments for toleration. His words, in what they suggest no less than in what they express, throw a flood of light on the status and vicissitudes of Catholics in Maryland. Boucher was quick to admit that a plea for toleration of papists from a Protestant pulpit was quite unique; but in extenuation of his conduct he pleaded that the subject was forced upon him by the "many particular unkindnesses which we are all of us too ready to show them solely on the score of their religion."[23] "Hardly a book" he continued, "or an article on religion has been written; hardly a sermon or any controverted point . . . has been preached; hardly a public debate or private conversation has been held on the subject of religion or politics, in which . . . the parties have not contrived to have . . . a thwack at Popery. . . . We have exhibited them, as some of our enemies are wont to exhibit those they call heretics, in an auto-da-fé, in a horrid dress, disfigured with monsters and devils." For these reasons and because of some recent proceedings relating to them he felt compelled "not only as a man but as a Christian, and (let me add) more particularly as a Protestant minister of the word of God," to advocate toleration to his people and to adopt it as personal practice. Far from apologizing for taking the part of defenseless and injured fellow citizens, he grieved that his brethren of the cloth had relegated the task to him, and he was conscience-stricken for having been remiss in duty for so long.[24]

---

[22] Boucher, *American Revolution.*
[23] *Ibid.*, p. 98.

With a boldness that bespoke true courage Boucher branded the abuse of papists as disgraceful. Those guilty of such conduct were "bigots, uncharitable and intolerant," who took on "the worst and most odious features of Popery." The toleration he advocated was religious, not political, in behalf of which he advanced an array of arguments drawn from the nature of religion, the spread of toleration, the character of bigots, and considerations equally cogent. While religion authorized recourse to argument and persuasion to make converts, it did not sanction the use of force. Moreover, the triumph of toleration in Protestant countries made it incumbent on Americans to advocate and abide by this principle. He insisted that, while "bigots of all communions are much the same, none are less charitable or more intolerant than certain declaimers against Popery—who yet constantly rail at Papists for their ignorance and bigotry";[25] likewise he held that only a blind partisan would "think everything wrong in the Church of Rome." Actually, as history proved, "wrong principles and wrong practices" characterized every age, nation, and sect, so that weak and wicked men who delighted in persecution might be found in every community. Granted that Protestants had suffered at the hands of papists, "What

---

[24] *Ibid.*

[25] *Ibid.*, p. 99.

Protestant," he queried, "dares to assure himself that, were Papists disposed to retaliate, they could not show us as long and as bloody a catalogue of Papists who have bled under Protestant hands?"[26] To assail popery "not with open, sober, serious and solid argument, but by insinuations and sarcasms thrown out with such a spirit of intemperance as even Papists might be ashamed of,"[27] discredited the champions of Protestantism and betokened consciousness of weakness, for only those who doubted their cause resorted to such artifices.

Equally obnoxious was the custom of throwing in their teeth the charge that Catholics were disposed to crouch to tyranny, simply because the accusation would have weight with the multitude. A truly Christian attitude counseled manifestation of superiority by better works or by recourse to arguments so valid that they begot conviction. Blest as was his congregation by membership in a church which could boast of being "one of the soundest and purest in Christendom," they were bound to defend this heritage in a manner compatible with Christian charity. They enjoyed no right to constitute themselves judges of others, however strongly they might disapprove of their religious tenets. Was not the misfortune of Catholics already extreme in adhering to doctrines which were obviously "either corruption or perversions of Scripture"? Finally, intolerance was particularly unseemly in the people of a province founded by Catholics, and many of whose citizens still adhered to that creed in spite of the hardships and disabilities such adherence entailed.[28]

But even in Maryland so severe an indictment of intolerance and narrowness of spirit availed little. Boucher would shortly discover that his voice was almost alone in crying out for toleration in the vast wilderness of intolerance; to his dismay he would find that it was quite futile to speak a word in behalf of papists or to endeavor to exorcise the evil spirits of fear, suspicion, and hatred which had held sway for so long. He would suffer for his courage, his charity, his forbearance. With this the plight of Catholics in Maryland, Boucher was appalled by the thought of their lot in colonies where Presbyterianism prevailed.

---

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 100.

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 264.

[28] *Ibid.*, p. 290.

A discussion of the number of Catholics in Maryland seems to be in place here, even though a later chapter will consider in detail the number of Catholics in the country and their ratio to the whole population.

As a matter of fact, how numerous were Catholics in Maryland on the eve of the American Revolution? No completely satisfying answer to this query is forthcoming, for every reply involves statistics that are disappointingly meagre, approximations that are vague, or mere guesses devoid of substantial value. A casual traveler might hazard an estimate based on personal observation, but expressions of opinion qualified by "chiefly" or "largely" do not engender conviction.[29]

The majority of Catholics lived in St. Mary's County, site of the original foundation in 1634, or in adjacent Charles County. What was the total population of each county, and how many of the people professed the Catholic faith? Dr. Charles Barker, who made an exhaustive study of pre-revolutionary Maryland, concludes that Catholics may have outnumbered Protestants in St. Mary's County, but he dismisses as at best a local situation the lament of the Anglican clergyman Arthur Hall that his parishioners were outnumbered three-to-one by Catholics. And he holds that there is little evidence for the rather common assertion that on the whole Catholics were "one in twelve or fourteen of the population."[30] The stubborn fact is that we have no reliable figures for 1776. Since Maryland's population in 1775 is usually given in round numbers as 200,000 and since this is very likely an overestimate, the official figure of 319,728 in the first census of 1790 affords no clue as to the percentage of increase. Similarly in 1790 St. Mary's County is credited with 8,216 whites, 6,985 slaves, and 343 free colored persons, a total of 15,544; and Charles County with 20,618, of whom 10,533 were free persons. But again, as we have no comparable figures for 1775, we cannot measure the increase during the previous two decades or deduce the population in 1776.[31] As we lack precise data we are forced to resort to inference, despite our awareness of the risk we incur.

---

[29] Nicholas Cresswell, *The Journal of Nicholas Cresswell, 1774-1777*, p. 30. New York, 1924.

[30] Barker, *Revolution in Maryland*, p. 43 note.

When the Maryland Convention about 1774 enjoined the enrollment of all males between sixteen and fifty years of age and their organization into companies for instruction in tactics and military science, it also imposed an assessment of ten thousand pounds, to be divided among the counties according to population. And the sum levied was to be expended on arms and ammunition under the supervision of the local committee. In the official tabulation St. Mary's County was ranked sixth and its assessment was six hundred pounds.[32] Thus it is evident that, while the county was not the most populous, neither was it sparsely inhabited. On the other hand in 1790 St. Mary's County ranked tenth of twenty counties in population, surpassed only by three on the east shore and six on the mainland,[33] while Charles County was seventh. St. Mary's had 15,544 people, Charles County 20,618.

Unfortunately fire and other destructive agencies have claimed most of the early records of the Catholic parishes in St. Mary's and Charles counties. Woodstock College treasures the few that survive. Foremost among them are the records for St. Inigoe's Manor compiled by Father Arnold Lievers and continued by others after his death in 1767, and the diary and record of Father James Walton, who was at Newtown from 1765 to 1784 except for an interval of one year at Frederick. Walton's record covers Our Lady's at Leonardtown and St. Aloysius at Medley's Neck.

---

[31] William Duane, *Return of the Whole Number of Persons within the Several Districts of the United States.* Washington, 1802.

[32] James McSherry, *History of Maryland,* pp. 180-81. Baltimore, 1850.

[33] Duane, *Return.*

One feature of Father Lievers' account is the prevalence of English family names.[34] Noteworthy also are the size of families and the extent of relationships. Impressive too is the frequency of the Christian name Ignatius, a consequence, as we shall see, of the fact that the priests were sons of St. Ignatius. The record for 1769, probably the work of Father John Lewis, surpasses previous years in fullness; a domestic note is the payment of eighteen hundred pounds of tobacco "clear of cask" as one year's rental by a certain Ignatius Clark, one of the tenants of St. Inigoe's Manor. Although there are various fragmentary lists of parishioners, nowhere is the total number of communicants indicated till 1794, when we learn that of a total of 581 (488 whites and 93 negroes), 392 communicated at Easter. Did the total of 581 include both sexes, and children as well as adults? If it did, it follows that 189 were children too young to communicate or adults delinquent in duty. At any rate, 1794 is nearly two decades removed from 1776, and the figures given are no safe index of the population at the earlier date.

Because of its comprehensiveness Father Walton's diary has exceptional value. In addition to being a register of baptisms, marriages, and funerals of white parishioners and their slaves, it is a ledger of contributions to the church and occasionally of business transactions of the parish, for the estates attached to the church were always the chief, and sometimes the sole, source of livelihood for the pastor and of revenue for the church. The broad and at times detailed coverage gives us a rewarding insight into parish life. Here too English surnames predominate[35] and the Christian name of Ignatius is very common.[36] Irish names are few, and frequently misspelled.[37]

---

[34] For example: Fenwick, Drury, Spalding, Gough, Cecil, Thompson, Stiles, Brewer, Atwood, Brown, Leigh, Howard, Clark, Sanders.

More limited than the accounts of Father Lievers and Father Walton is the "Ordo Baptizatorum" of Father Joseph Moseley of St. Joseph's Parish in St. Mary's County. One feature is common to all three records: the frequency with which baby boys were christened Ignatius. Sponsors were also so named.

In a subsequent chapter we shall discuss the plausibility of using the name Ignatius as the basis for inference of Catholicity among Maryland's militia and regular troops. At present we must fix our attention on the pastors of the congregations in St. Mary's and Charles counties, without however overlooking the others. A definite ratio should subsist between the number of pastors and the number of parishioners, but it seems to defy determination. Jesuits had labored in Maryland since the very inception of the colony, and prior to 1774 it appears that all of the priests were Jesuits.[38] The number of Jesuits increased from seventeen in 1764 to twenty-three in 1771, then declined to twenty in 1773, with Port Tobacco in Charles County serving as a sort of headquarters.[39] One who was in no way associated with the Jesuit missionaries states that the church at Port Tobacco was impressive, that the residence of the four or five Jesuits was well constructed, that the estate of the manor comprised ten thousand acres, and that the slaves numbered two or three hundred.[40] These figures illustrate how easy it is for a casual observer to be misled by hearsay or superficial observation, for on July 23, 1765, Father George Hunter, the Jesuit superior in America, reported to the English provincial, Father Dennet, that the Port Tobacco holdings consisted of 900 acres and a distant tract of 3,500, while the slaves were 38, of whom 3 were in domestic service, 18 were employed in the fields, and the rest were children or superannuated.[41] Presumably Honyman described conditions in 1775, but a decade would scarcely have witnessed an expansion from 4,400 to 10,000 acres, or an increase in slaves from a mere thirty-eight to "two or three hundred." The variation, then, in acreage and in slaves is quite excessive, for the Jesuit missionaries living at Fort Tobacco were not in the real-estate business, nor were they engaged in the breeding of slaves.

---

[35] For example: Abell, Boarman, Plowden, Spalding, Sewell, Brooke, Fenwick, Wheeler, Dant, Mattingly, Ford, Drury, Joy, Greenwood, Gough, Diggs.

[36] Among baptisms recorded for 1770 are: daughter, Ignatius and Mary Combs; daughter, Ignatius and Elizabeth Greenwell; twin daughters, Ignatius and Mary More; daughter, Ignatius and Theresa Wheatly; negro of Ignatius and Sarah Fenwick; daughter, Ignatius and Mary Cecil; for 1773—daughter, Ignatius and Mitor [?] Cecil; son, Ignatius and Anastasia Drury; son, Ignatius and Ann Goddard; daughter, Ignatius and Ann Brown; daughter, Ignatius and Dorothy Fenwick; son, Ignatius and Mary Medley.

[37] For example, Conali, Conaly, Raily, Reily.

[38] Thomas D'Arcy McGee, *A History of the Irish Settlers in North America from the Earliest Period to the Census of 1850*, p. 75. Boston, 1855.

[39] Guilday, *John Carroll*, p. 62, quoting from the *Relation of John Mattingly to Propaganda.* See also *Catholic Historical Review*, Vol. 2, p. 317, October 1916.

With the suppression of the Society of Jesus by Pope Clement XIV in 1773, the Jesuits in British North America found themselves unattached, doubtful of their status, and largely cut off from one another. Rather evenly divided between native Americans and Englishmen, with a quota of German born at work among the German-speaking people in Pennsylvania, they faced an uncertain future. A number of Englishmen returned to their homeland, but the majority adjusted themselves to the new situation and continued their ministry in their respective locations as secular priests. We are not concerned here with the ecclesiastical arrangement ultimately set up. Actually the contacts of the Jesuits with one another, even before the suppression of the order, appear to have been limited and irregular. Certainly they were not the closely knit conspiratorial association that writers of fiction delight in portraying. In part this dissociation was due to poor communication and the difficulties and hardships of travel, in part to the multiplicity of their pastoral duties; but it comes as a shock to find so alert and well-informed a man as Father John Carroll confess that he never had met some of his confrères who labored in Pennsylvania and could not even recall their names.[42]

---

[40] Robert Honyman, *Colonial Panorama 1775, Dr. Robert Honyman's Journal*, edited by Philip Padelford, p. 3. San Marino, 1939.

[41] Thomas Hughes, *The History of the Society of Jesus in North America*, Documents 1, pt. 1, p. 336. London and New York, 1908.

Unexplained variations and discrepancies are to be found in the several extant lists of the priests in the British colonies. Despite his admission just noted, John Carroll above all others was in a position to enlighten us. He lists John Ashton, John and Sylvester Boarman, John Bolton, Bernard Diderick, Thomas Digges, Ferdinand Farmer, James Frambach, George Hunter, Augustine Jenkins, John Lewis, Benjamin Roels [Lewis], Ignatius Matthews, Richard Molyneaux, Peter Morris, Joseph Moseley, Bennet Neale, James Pellentz, Charles Sewall, and James Walton.[43] These twenty and Carroll himself, with the "two or three Germans in the back settlements of Pennsylvania" unknown to Carroll, would constitute twenty-three or twenty-four priests all told. But a contemporary manuscript in the archives of Woodstock College adds the names of Luke Geissler, Robert Harding, Matthew Manners, Bernard Rich, and J. B. Ritter and omits the two Boarmans, Diderick, Jenkins, Molyneaux, and Carroll himself, a remarkable omission indeed.

---

[42] Catholic priests in the American colonies—

John Carroll to Charles Plowden . . . . .

"All our gentlemen are, thank God, pretty well, except Mr. Hunter, who is often ailing. Messrs. Bolton & Roels are with him at Port Tobacco. John is a good fellow, and active missionary, & fully as much a good fisherman & hunter; as for Lewis Roels, if he can get his cup of grog, i.e. rum and water, he will never overturn states, or resettle our independency. Messrs. Morris, Walton, Bent, Neale, the two Boarmans (John still as he was) Jenkins are in the lower parts of the country, and I seldom see them: indeed I have not seen the three former, since I came to Maryland. Messrs. Digges, Ashton & Diderick are my nearest neighbors, & are well. The former would be a favorite of yours, if you knew him. Messrs. Matthews, Lewis, Sewal & Mosely live a great way from me; so do Messrs. Frambach & Pellentz. About three years ago, I saw Messrs. Molyneux & Fermor [sic] at Philadelphia; the former the same good natured creature you ever knew him, as fat as a porpoise, which occasions his neck to appear much shorter than it ever did, and therefore fills him with dreadful apprehension of going off in apoplexy. I think I have now gone through the catalogue, as you requested to have them all called over by name. I have only omitted two or three Germans in the back settlement of Pennsylvania, whose names I do not recollect, and whose persons I never saw; however, they are well" (Catholic University of America Transcripts).

Confusion and uncertainty are heightened by a "relation" of Father John Mattingly, who was not included in either of the above tabulations. His document is of uncertain date, but it is usually held to be later than September 6, 1773. According to Mattingly there were ninety-five Jesuits in America, twenty-six priests, twenty-five scholastics (men preparing for the priesthood), ten novice scholastics, twenty-five lay brothers, and nine novice lay brothers.[44] But in the opinion of Peter Guilday, Mattingly was reminiscing after his return to England, and his "relation" should be dated after 1806.[45] The discrepancy in the number of priests, who alone could engage actively in the ministry, given variously as twenty, twenty-three or twenty-four, and twenty-six, is much of a mystery. It may be that deaths, arrivals, and departures were slow in coming to the notice of the several compilers of statistics. At all events, Mattingly testifies that the Jesuits were home-loving men, that they traveled only when obliged to do so by duty, that they were engrossed in their spiritual duties and withdrew from secular life insofar as their ministry allowed. This other-worldliness, this absorption in priestly duty and abstention from "public spectacles and secular meetings," no less than their shunning of politics, won for them the respect and acclaim of their flocks and of others.[46]

---

[43] Joseph Zwinge, "The Jesuit Farms in Maryland," *Woodstock Letters*, Vol. 42, no. 2, p. 137.

[44] *Catholic Historical Review*, Vol. 2, p. 320, October 1916.

[45] Guilday, *John Carroll*, p. 62 note.

By the same token, however, this aloofness, so general as to be predicated of the group, would argue against their taking a leading or even an active part in the imminent or current political disturbances and Revolution. Character too predisposed some of them against involvement, as we learn from Carroll, who in 1779 unfolded to Charles Plowden in England his conviction that Lewis [Roels] "will never overthrow states or settle our Independence."[47] Finally, to the priests of German rearing and background, the controversies between England and her colonies may well have seemed meaningless or unintelligible.

While Mattingly was correct in asserting that in Pennsylvania the Catholic Church was free, he erred or indulged in an outburst of unwarranted optimism when he asserted that in Maryland there was practically complete freedom of worship; above all he overlooked the unrepealed penal laws and the dormant hostility apt to awaken on occasion and clamor for their enforcement. His estimate that the Catholic population of Maryland and Pennsylvania was twenty thousand appears to be extravagant. The basis for this computation may have been the report of Father George Hunter, superior of the Jesuits in America, on July 23, 1765, to the English provincial, Father Dennet, in which Hunter states, "We count 10,000 adult Customers or Commts [communicants] and near as many under age or non-Com."[48]

At best this is but another approximation in round numbers; and the assertion that one half of the parishioners were children or adults utterly remiss in their religious duties is out of harmony with the usual portrayal of the religious scene. Furthermore it is contradicted by other evidence. In the annual catalogue or official listing of the priests for 1781 a note appended tells us that Maryland's Catholic population comprised nine thousand adults, three thousand children and an equal number of slaves. It must be admitted that these figures appear to have been added later than 1781, and moreover they are suspect because they are identical with those given in 1785.[49]

---

[46] *Ibid.*, p. 317. "Vitam ducunt, quantum eorum ministerium patitur, a mundi conversatione remotam; unde exemplum non est ut quis eorum publicis spectaculis, vel aliis profanis himinum coetibus interfuerit. Hinc fit ut in magna veneratione, non solum a Catholicis, sed etiam ab haereticis habeantur." See also Hughes, *Society of Jesus*, Vol. 2, p. 555.

[47] Zwinge, "Jesuit Farms," p. 137.

[48] Hughes, *Society of Jesus*, Documents, Vol. 1, pt. 1, p. 337.

No one was so conversant with actual conditions as Father John Carroll. A native of Maryland with good family ties and a wide personal acquaintance supplemented by long years in ministry, he stood out among the clergy to such a degree that he was to be unanimously designated the first Catholic bishop of the United States. His report to Cardinal Antonelli on "The State of Religion in the Provinces of the United States" is the first document of the kind sent to Rome and is the fruit of wide and careful inquiry,[50] but it was drawn up some years after the Revolution. From November 1784 to March 1, 1785, the date of the document, Carroll garnered data and information through correspondence and personal contact. How much thought or care his confrères, already burdened with a multiplicity of duties and interests, gave this matter we have no means of knowing. At all events, in the end Carroll despite his efforts contented himself with approximations; he was simply unable to furnish the exact figures that we crave.

Rome was advised that Maryland had in the neighborhood of 15,800 Catholics, of whom 9,000 were freemen, adults, or over twelve years of age, while some 3,000 were children and about the same number slaves of all ages. To Pennsylvania, Carroll assigned approximately 7,000 Catholics, very few of whom were slaves; Virginia was thought to have "not more than 300," and according to report New York had "at least 1,500." Actually this estimate for New York was a gross overrating. Carroll fixed the total Catholic population of the United States in 1785 as somewhat less than 25,000. Carroll's figures were as authoritative and precise as any could be. To some extent they negate those of Mattingly. At least half of the 9,000 classified as freemen in Maryland must have been women and girls, and further deductions must be made for mere striplings, for the aged, and for the physically unfit and infirm inasmuch as none of them could serve in the armed forces of the colony in the impending conflict. We are aware that extravagant estimates of the Catholic population have been advanced by misguided enthusiasts, but in the light of the available evidence we feel justified in dismissing them without consideration.

---

[49] John A. Morgan, editor, *Annual Catalogues of the Maryland Mission of the Society of Jesus 1634-1808.* Woodstock College Library.

[50] *Catholic Historical Review,* Vol. 6, p. 244, July 1920.

From the evidence at hand we must conclude that in 1776 there could scarcely have been more than 20,000 Catholics in a total population of around 2,500,000. And in Maryland, which saw the greatest concentration of Catholics, the number available for active military service would be limited to perhaps 3,000 or less. How would this body of men react to the opportunities created by the engulfing of the country in war? And what would be the impact of the situation on their relations with their Protestant fellow citizens? Would the strained relations continue unabated or would the crisis command Catholic support and hearty cooperation, and would this outpouring of patriotism win recognition, diminish antagonism, and pave the way to understanding and more friendly feelings? Were Maryland Catholics destined to play a conspicuous or insignificant role, an honorable or a petty one, in the effort to secure independence?

CHAPTER V

Pennsylvania before 1776

The fortunes of Catholics in Pennsylvania merit special consideration. In view of the intolerant attitude that prevailed elsewhere in the English colonies, the liberal religious policy of the Penn family made Pennsylvania the only haven for the victims of religious oppression and persecution, particularly after Maryland's attempt to rival her most extreme sister colonies.[1] While Catholics were less numerous than in Maryland, their lot was much happier. By profession, so to speak, Quakers were broad-minded and tolerant; and the coexistence of various sects called for forbearance towards those of another religious persuasion. In time this spirit was extended even to Catholics in the form of complete toleration, not, however, of unqualified acceptance as citizens; for even here Catholics were debarred from office. Such exclusion, however, was not felt as a great denial by men habituated to it in the land of their birth. Unrestricted practice of their religion was what they sought, and this was allowed. Neither did the withholding of the franchise seem an intolerable grievance to those who had never known this privilege. On the frontier—and that was not far from Philadelphia—where Irish or Scotch Presbyterians and German Lutherans predominated, Catholics were still objects of deep-rooted antipathy liable to erupt into repressive action; but in the very stronghold of Quakerism the voice of bigotry was weak and ineffectual.

---

[1] "The only thing about which colonists were in earnest which found favor in the eyes of Englishmen, was their zeal for Protestantism, which, whatever might be its defects, never failed to exclude Catholics from office" (Charles J. Stille, "Religious Tests in Provincial Pennsylvania," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, p. 404, January 1886).

There was an influx of Germans into Pennsylvania between 1725 and 1740. In their ranks were German Reformed, Lutherans, Catholics, Moravians, and Swenckfelders.[2] A certain Jonas Rupp who happened upon one of their settlements judged them a surly and morose people, "divers of them Papists," the men well armed and warlike.[3] This German immigration was but a phase of the larger movement from western Europe to America. In 1729 as many as 4,500 immigrants, chiefly "passengers and servants from Ireland," stepped ashore at New Castle. Philadelphia's allotment of newcomers that year was quite diversified, for it included 1,115 from Ireland, 267 English or Welsh, 243 Palatine Germans, and 43 Scots. The distinction between Irish and Scots may be significant. Only the Germans were classified simply as passengers, the other national groups being registered as passengers and servants. The predominance of people from Ireland arrests attention.[4] It would seem that very few of these new arrivals were content to locate in the port of entry; as a rule they sought home on the not-too-distant frontier, where good land was abundant and easily obtained.

Although the Irish were greatly in the majority among the recent arrivals, there could not have been many Catholics among them. At all events, prior to 1732 Philadelphia had no Catholic church, but the few inhabitants who were of that faith assembled and worshiped in a private dwelling whenever a priest arrived from Maryland. In 1732 or 1733 they erected a chapel or church dedicated to St. Joseph, and a resident pastor began to exercise his priestly ministry.[5] This arrangement, however, was not effected without exciting alarm and opposition. The celebration of Mass perturbed the provincial council, and the governor was inclined to decree its discontinuance.[6]

---

[2] I. Daniel Rupp, *History of the Counties of Berks and Lebanon*, p. 91. Lancaster, 1844.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 92.

[4] Thomas F. Gordon, *History of Pennsylvania*, pp. 207-08. Philadelphia, 1829.

The opening of this inconspicuous chapel in Philadelphia marks a turning point in the history of Catholicism in Pennsylvania; for as St. Joseph's was the offspring of the church in Maryland, so St. Joseph's would become the parent of daughter churches in the outlying territory. From this center missionaries radiated to the small Catholic groups beyond the city. Thus they made their way to Chester County, but the Catholic community there was so small that only in 1760 was the congregation properly organized.[7] At an early date Montgomery County acquired a cosmopolitan population of Germans, English, Irish, Welsh, Swedes, and Frenchmen, among whom one would seek in vain for a sizable group of Catholics. Consequently the few German Catholics in the upper part of the county were attached to Goshenhoppen, [8] but the mere handful of uncertain national stock in the lower part of the county were obliged to repair to Philadelphia to worship, a circumstance that did not foster an active faith.[9] Bucks County was equally devoid of Catholics. The few Germans in the western section were included in the Goshenhoppen parish. In 1744 the Jesuits of Goshenhoppen began a mission at the east base of Haycock Mountain for the convenience of some German and Irish families, but services were only occasional and had to be conducted in homes.[10] Cumberland County had an Irish community, but in 1757 Father Ferdinand Farmer could list only twelve communicants.

---

[5] J. Bennett Nolan, *Southeastern Pennsylvania*, Vol. 1, p. 576. 2 vols. Philadelphia, 1943; Gordon, *Pennsylvania*, p. 510.

[6] Gordon, *Pennsylvania*, p. 570.

[7] Nolan, *Pennsylvania*, Vol. 1, p. 257.

[8] Rupp, *Berks and Lebanon*, p. 462. "As early as 1755 they had a 'very magnificent chapel' at Goshenhoppen."

[9] Nolan, *Pennsylvania*, Vol. 2, p. 704.

Although Berks County was a Protestant stronghold, the Catholic minority was organized as early as 1740 in the western corner when Father Schneider, a Jesuit, began a mission at Goshenhoppen, now known as Bally, among the German settlers.[11] Two years later a log chapel, the Church of the Blessed Sacrament, was built and dedicated. Father Theodore Schneider, S.J., was born in the Rhineland. He had been rector of the University of Heidelberg, but he had relinquished this post to devote himself to missionary work in America.[12] Though the Catholics of German extraction were his special charge, he and his successors traveled the length and breadth of the county, ministering impartially to white men and Indians, and extended their activity to Montgomery, Bucks, and Schuylkill counties. They also founded the churches in Maxatawny and Reading.

This foundation in Reading prospered so notably that by 1755 the parish had a resident priest and the "magnificent chapel" already mentioned. Over and above the spiritual benefits accruing to the people, this parish in Reading interests the historian because an incident in its early days became the means of providing exact information on the number of Catholics in Pennsylvania, which otherwise would be denied us. Moreover, the affair gives us a clue to the standing of Catholics in the community; it reveals that not even a modicum of trust was accorded to people of that belief; it demonstrates the facility with which old prejudices could be revived; it brings out the proneness of the people to believe the worst of Catholics.

---

[10] *Ibid.*, Vol. 1, p. 425.

[11] "Very few Irish settled in Reading and Berks County and never was there what might be called an Irish colony in the community" (Raymond W. Albright, *Two Centuries of Reading, Pennsylvania*, 1748-1948, p. 11. [Reading, 1948]).

[12] Nolan, *Pennsylvania*, Vol. 1, p. 118.

When the so-called French and Indian War broke out, Reading and the other frontier outposts found themselves in an exposed position. That the people should be concerned, even alarmed, was natural. Such a situation proved fertile ground for gossip, rumor, suspicion, and the revival of dormant prejudices. On the arbitrary assumption that identity of religion with the French must imply a community of interests in all respects, the loyalty of Catholics was questioned. Upon them fell the full brunt of attack. One individual accused the French of sending "Jesuitical emissaries" among the Germans to convert them to the "Popish religion" and so undermine their allegiance.[13] Though Lutherans and the Reformed were greatly in the majority, the Catholics, actually only 205 in number, divided into three localities and 97 of them women, were magnified into a first-rate menace.[14] Gossip affirmed that Catholics had a cache of arms, that they were conspiring with the French in Canada and beyond the mountains, and only awaited a favorable opportunity to pounce on their Protestant neighbors and exterminate them.[15] Apprehension and bitterness mounted. Terrified and perplexed, the distraught Protestant justices drew up a petition to Governor Morris on July 23, 1755. Among the signers were Henry Harvey, James Reed, William Bird, Jonas Seeley,[16] and Conrad Weiser, the redoubtable Indian fighter. In this document the 205 Catholics were multiplied into a "very numerous" body and set down as a threat to public safety. Would the governor direct the petitioners how to proceed in this "important business"? After discussing the issue with the executive council, the governor on August 25 replied in a manner calculated to allay the fears of these unduly disquieted frontiersmen, inasmuch as his excellency insisted that "there was little foundation for their representations."[17] With this assurance the hysteria abated. A recent historian strives to clarify the incident and exonerate the people on the score that the local Catholics were so closely affiliated with the French by ecclesiastical bonds.[18] This hackneyed subterfuge betrays woeful disregard of logic; it only revives an old unfounded charge that Catholics of every nationality must be leagued against the Protestants of their own or any other nation. With a wilderness intervening between them and a language barrier a formidable obstacle to intercourse, the two groups were wholly isolated from one another. In reality were the Catholics of Pennsylvania's backwoods any more closely associated with their coreligionists in Canada than with those in Italy or Poland or the Rhineland? Do not hysteria and religious prejudice explain the widespread apprehension more fully?

---

[13] Rupp, *Berks and Lebanon*, p. 95.

[14] Morton L. Montgomery, *The History of Berks County in Pennsylvania*, p. 368. Philadelphia, 1886.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 367.

[16] The child of one of Seeley's two slaves was baptized by Father J. B. De Ritter on May 11, 1766 (Albright, *Reading, Pennsylvania*, p. 57).

Consequent in time and perhaps also in causal relationship to this flurry in Berks County was a census of Catholics in Pennsylvania ordered by Lord Loudoun in 1757, and an outrageous Militia Act of the same year. Loudoun's decree elicited from the four Jesuit priests active in Pennsylvania a tabulation according to their individual ministration, giving the location, sex, and national extraction of their communicants as of April 29, 1757.[19] The extreme importance of this document entitles it to a place in our text. Moreover, it has been accepted as authoritative by historians.[20]

---

[17] Montgomery, *Berks County*, p. 794.

[18] Albright, *Reading, Pennsylvania*, p. 43.

[19] Mr. Harding to Rd. Mr. Peters "I send ye number of ye Roman Catholicks in this town, and of those whom I visit in the county; Mr. Sneider is not in Town, to give in an account of ye Germans; but I have heard him often say, yt ye whole number of Roman Catholicks, English, Irish & Germans, including men, women & children, does not exceed two thousand.

I remain Hd. Sr
Yr. Humble Sert,
Robert Harding."

Manuscript, Pennsylvania Historical Society.

An analysis of this report should prove rewarding. It reveals a grand total of 1,365 Catholics in the whole province of Pennsylvania, of whom 692 were males and 672 females. On the basis of locality Philadelphia ranked first with 378 in the city and an additional 25 in the county. Griffin contends that these

---

[20] J. Thomas Scharf and Thompson Westcott, *History of Philadelphia 1609-1884*, Vol. 2, pp. 1369-70. 3 vols. Philadelphia, 1884.

"Catholics in Pennsylvania in 1757

"Lord Loudoun, commander of the British army in America, had a return made to him on April 29, 1757, of the Roman Catholics in 1757, which is as follows:

	Men	Women
"Under the care of Robert Harding		
In and about Philadelphia, all Irish (or German)	72	78
In Chester County	18	22
Under the care of Father Schneider		
In and about Philadelphia, being all Germans	107	121
Philadelphia County, but up county	15	10
Berks Co.	62	55
Northampton Co.	68	62
Northampton Co., Irish	17	12
Bucks Co.	14	11
Chester Co.	13	9
Chester Co., Irish	9	6
Care of Father Farmer [Steynmeyer]		
Lancaster Co., Germans	108	94
Lancaster Co., Irish	22	27
Berks Co., Germans	41	39
Berks Co., Irish	5	3
Chester Co., Irish	23	17
Chester Co., Germans	3	—
Cumberland Co., Irish	6	6
Care of Matthias Manners [Sittensperger]		
York Co., Germans	54	62
York Co., Irish	35	38
	692	672

Total Catholic population of Pennsylvania—1365" figures comprised only those above 12 years of age who received the sacraments, but he gives no evidence for this limitation[21] and the document itself does not mention or suggest it. After Philadelphia came Lancaster County with 251,[22] Berks with 203, York with 199, Northampton with 159, Chester with 120, Bucks with a mere 25. That Germans predominated among the Catholics is established by this report, but whether they were more than twice as numerous as the Irish and English, as has been maintained,[23] is doubtful. After all, Father Robert Harding's tabulation for Philadelphia classified his 150 communicants as Irish or Germans.[24] Kuhns' facile generalization that the Catholic Germans of this day apostatized in such numbers that in 1901 one rarely found a Catholic of German ancestry is unsubstantiated by evidence.[25] As a matter of fact Germans outnumbered other Catholics in Philadelphia and in Lancaster, Berks, York, and Northampton counties, but in Chester and Cumberland counties they were a minority. Their most flourishing communities were in Philadelphia and in Lancaster, Berks, and York counties, while Chester and Cumberland could scarcely have been more than missions.

---

[21] Martin I. J. Griffin, *History of "Old Saint Joseph's," Philadelphia*, p. 3. Philadelphia, 1882.

[22] "The people of Lancaster are principally emegrants from Germany & talk their native language. There are houses of public worship for the Lutherans, the German Calvinists, the Presbyterians, the Episcopalians, the Roman Catholics, each one. The Lutheran's the largest. Some Moravians and Jews" (David McClure, *The Diary of David McClure*, edited by Franklin B. Dexter, July 16, [1772], p. 32. [New York, 1899]).

[23] Martin I. J. Griffin, "Irish Catholics and the Revolution," *American Catholic Historical Researches*, Vol. 27, p. 341, 1910.

[24] "William Smith in his 'Brief State of the Province of Pennsylvania' declared one fourth of the Germans were Catholics, while the rest were liable to be seduced by every enterprising Jesuit. As a matter of fact, out of the total population in 1757 only 1365 were Catholics, of whom 923 were Germans" (Oscar Kuhns, *The German and Swiss Settlements of Colonial Pennsylvania*, p. 143. [New York, 1901]).

[25] *Ibid.*, pp. 171-72.

While Father Matthias Manners, whose true name was Sittensperger, restricted his ministry to the Germans of York County,[26] Fathers Harding, Schneider, and Farmer [Steynmeyer] gave attention to all races and nationalities. It should be noted that Berks County, so recently the scene of a Catholic scare, was home to only 205 Catholics; and Reading, the very center of the agitation, could count but 45 male and 42 female Catholics.[27] The very idea that 45 German Catholics, or 87 if the women are included, could have terrorized the county is preposterous. That general alarm is rather a comment on human credulity when religious animosity is reinforced by war hysteria.

But the hoary tradition of a Catholic penchant for caching arms and awaiting an opportunity to slaughter Protestants did not die with Governor Morris' disarming letter to the petitioners of Berks County. Though Catholics were scattered and in a minority and under the constant scrutiny of their neighbors, the belief persisted and brought into being the Militia Act of 1757.[28] In the stringency of its enactments and the severity of the sanctions the prevalent mentality stands revealed, and it is not benevolent. First it prescribed that when the names of men liable to military service are listed inquiry should be made and recorded of their religious sentiments, "especially such as are Papists or reputed Papists." All such are to be excluded from the militia. Moreover "all arms, military accoutrements, gunpowder and ammunition of what kind soever" found in the possession of a papist are to be confiscated by the colonel of the district and applied to public use. Penalty for false denial of possession or concealment of arms was fixed at imprisonment for three months. Finally, though debarred from the militia and forbidden arms even for self-defense on the frontier and for other legitimate uses, all "papists" between the ages of seventeen and forty-five are to be taxed twenty shillings and parents are made surety for minor sons. Of course such legislation strikes us as fantastic and extreme, and as contravening the basic principles of lawmaking, but the precautions taken to insure security demonstrate how real the menace seemed to contemporaries. A groundless fear may be as terrifying as one that is genuine.

---

[26] "In the year 1776, Joseph Smith purchased a lot, with a house, in the borough of York, and conveyed the same to the Catholics" (I. Daniel Rupp, *History of York County*, p. 702. [Lancaster, 1845]).

[27] Montgomery, *Berks County*, p. 794.

[28] Scharf and Westcott, *Philadelphia*, Vol. 2, p. 1370.

Another product of war mentality was the arrest of five Catholic men and one Catholic woman in Philadelphia on the vague accusation of disaffection. The victims were Barnabas McGee, Joseph Rivers, Thomas McCormick, Rowley Kane, Doctor Hugh Matthews, and Jane Dorsius.[29] We do not know the sequel to the arrest; but as the war, under Pitt's masterful guidance, turned into a succession of British victories which swept away the threat to the frontier, the frenzy may have collapsed and given way to normal sanity. At all events, by 1759 Burnaby was intrigued by Pennsylvania's toleration "of all other sects." In confirmation he enumerated the churches, among them "one Romish chapel, eight or ten places of religious worship; viz. two churches [Episcopal], three Quaker meeting-houses, two Presbyterian ditto, one Lutheran church, one Dutch Calvanist ditto, one Swedish church, one Romish chapel, one Anabaptist meeting-house, one Moravian ditto."[30] Indeed, such calm and peace prevailed that about 1763 Doctor Richard Challoner, vicar for the colonies but residing in England, suggested a vicar apostolic should reside in Philadelphia because in no other place in the British dominions were Catholics granted such freedom in the practice of their faith.[31] Further testimony to these happy relations comes from the Gottingen professor Gottfried Achenwall in 1767, who marveled that in all respects, apart from disbarment from office because of conscientious objection to the oaths and test act at induction to office, Catholics enjoyed full religious equality in Pennsylvania.[32]

---

[29] *Ibid.*, Vol. 1, p. 253.

[30] Burnaby, *Travels*, p. 90.

[31] "Challoner to Stonor, An Account of the Condition of the Catholic Religion in the English Colonies of America," *Catholic Historical Review*, Vol. 6, p. 524, January 1921.

Another signal manifestation of desire to actualize religious freedom and equality is found in a letter of March 15, 1771, from Joseph Shippen to Edward Shippen, who had made an inquiry as to the writer's manner of handling a detail of his office. Marriage licenses contained the phrase "any Protestant Minister," but Joseph Shippen confessed that over a period of several years he had blotted out these words and inserted "Reverend Mr. Harding or Reverend Mr. Ferdinand Farmer" whenever their parishioners applied for a license. In self-justification he argued that, before he began to alter the wording of the license, he had obtained the approval of Governor Penn. Furthermore he pleaded that, since the public exercise of their religion was accorded to Catholics in the province, no valid objection to his procedure could be advanced. And besides, in addition to approving the practice in respect to the two priests named, Governor Penn had also authorized it for Reverend Mr. Geissler under similar circumstances.[33]

This statement of the "public exercise" of the Catholic faith, to which Joseph Shippen appealed as warrant for his conduct, appears to have been somewhat a question of semantics. In any event, it was qualified by Father Ferdinand Farmer, who informed a certain Father Well that, while each denomination was granted its respective form of worship in private, it could not indulge in the public performance of its rites. At the same time, however, nobody could be constrained to participate in the services of any creed other than his own or be forced to contribute to its support. Father Farmer held with Shippen that, since the oaths of naturalization and at the taking of office contained a renunciation of the Catholic religion, they excluded Catholics from these favors.[34] Thus Father Farmer's testimony raises the issue of how many of the Catholics who migrated from countries other than British dominions, or their descendants, could have been full-fledged citizens when the War for Independence began. Their status of noncitizen and foreigner would have an appreciable effect on their attitude and interest in all political issues, including the alternative of independence or continued subjection to England.

---

[32] Gottfried Achenwall, "Achenwall's Observations on North America," translated by J. G. Rosengarten, *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, Vol. 27, p. 12, January 1903.

[33] *The Balch Papers*, Vol. 2. Manuscript, Pennsylvania Historical Society Library.

One more testimonial to good will and broad-mindedness was the Society of the Friendly Sons of Saint Patrick, a fraternal and social organization that included Presbyterians, Quakers, Episcopalians, and Catholics "united like a band of brothers."[35] Among the one hundred members, exclusive of honorary and adopted members, in March 1771 were seven Catholics: John Barry, Thomas Fitzsimmons, George Meade, and the four Moylans, Stephen, John, James, and Jasper.[36] Obviously seven in a hundred is not a high percentage, but the very fact of their membership is significant.

On the frontier, however, where Presbyterians abounded, the religious pattern common to the colonies would prevail, and it might involve other Protestant groups as well as Catholics. These staunch followers of John Knox were quick to sense danger and to thwart the introduction of whatever they regarded as novelties or errors. Thus, at Proctor's Tent the itinerant preacher David McClure met with opposition and was denied permission to preach because he belonged to no presbytery but was a New England Congregationalist minister. His amazement was profound when he discovered that these people were ignorant of the very existence of Congregationalists. Some other frontier communities were not so particular, for they allowed him to expound the word of God.[37]

---

[34] Father Ferdinand Farmer to Father Well, in Hughes, *Society of Jesus*, Vol. 2, p. 183.

[35] *A Brief Account of the Society of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick*, p. 15. Philadelphia, 1844.

[36] Haltigan, *Irish*, p. 52.

That bigotry is blind and explosive was brought home to the distinguished minister Henry Melchior Muhlenberg. When he was on the point of setting out for South Carolina and Georgia, it was rumored that the real purpose of his going abroad was to celebrate Mass for King George, who was said to have turned papist.[38] In this wise he learned how easily the dormant animus of an individual bigot, or of a small group, could galvanize others into activity, even in Pennsylvania.

But after all, McClure's experience might be interpreted as a justified precaution against impostors; moreover, there is no accounting for the caprice of an individual who gives vent to his bias. Without fail visitors to Philadelphia, foreigners no less than Americans, were impressed by the number of churches, the variety of denominations, and the harmony and good will that prevailed between these divergent, even mutually contradictory, creeds. Sometimes, as in the case of John Adams already considered, their words, by indirection, throw light on the situation in their own city or colony. In 1775 Patrick M'Roberts counted eleven churches or meetinghouses and several other places of worship belonging "to other sectaries,"[39] in a city of reputedly forty thousand inhabitants; and in 1776 Nicholas

---

[37] McClure, *Diary*, pp. 103, 105, 106.

[38] Henry Muhlenberg, *The Journals of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg*, translated by Theodore G. Tappert and edited by John W. Doberstein, Vol. 2, p. 693. 2 vols. Philadelphia, 1945.

[39] Patrick M'Roberts, "Tour through Part of the Northern Provinces of America," edited by Carl Bridenbaugh, *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, Vol. 59, p. 166. 1935.

Cresswell noted eight churches and thirteen meetinghouses, all of them plain buildings, not one of them pretentious.[40]

One almost senses the astonishment and satisfaction of these casual visitors as they commit their observations to their journals. The most complete enumeration appears to be that of Robert Proud, who first mentions the Quakers as founders of the province, then Episcopalians, "German Lutherans, Presbyterians, and Independents of various kinds, German Calvinists, Catholics, Jews, Baptists of different kinds, German Mennonists, Dunkards or Dumplers, Moravians and Swenkfelders, besides the aborigines of America."[41] The abrupt transition from a religious to an ethnic basis is not explained. So great was the variety of religious persuasions that Thomas Anburey surmised that every faith was to be found in the province. To him the harmony among the people was a source of edification and a reason for rejoicing. He expressed his approbation in the exclamation, "Would to Heaven that harmony was equally as prevalent all over the globe." He assumed that the "Dumplers" were unknown to his readers.[42] On his part John Adams drew sly satisfaction from the circumstance that Episcopalians were so few and the others so numerous that the former had considerable difficulty in maintaining themselves.

Father Ferdinand Farmer was associated with St. Joseph's from 1759 till his death on August 17, 1786, and Father Robert Molyneaux assisted him. When the Legislature of the State revoked the charter of the College of Philadelphia in 1779 and established the University of the State of Pennsylvania, the act of establishment specified that the board of trustees must include the "senior ministers" of the Lutheran, Episcopal, Presbyterian, Baptist, German Calvinist, and Roman Catholic churches in Philadelphia. This unique arrangement held until September 1791 when a new charter dropped the stipulation as to "senior ministers." By the act of 1779 Father Farmer, then an ex-Jesuit, became probably the first Catholic, and certainly the first Catholic priest, to hold civil office in Pennsylvania. Thus a small breach was made in the barrier of exclusion of Catholics from public office. A small breach, to be sure, yet one that was a portent of the future.

---

[40] "Three English churches, Christ Church, St. Paul's and St. Peter's, and two Dutch Lutheran Churches. Nine dissenting meeting houses, two Roman Chapels, Four Quaker meeting houses, and a Swedish Church" (Cresswell, *Journal.* p. 155).

[41] Robert Proud, *History of Pennsylvania in North America*, Vol. 2, p. 338. 2 vols. Philadelphia, 1797, 1798.

[42] Thomas Anburey, *Travels through the Interior Parts of North America*, Vol. 2, pp. 165-66, 169. 2 vols. Boston and New York, 1923.

German immigrants swelled the Catholic community of Philadelphia to such a degree that St. Joseph's became inadequate, and St. Mary's, a larger and more elaborate church, was built before 1776.[43] Many Germans, however, pushed on to the back country of Pennsylvania and Maryland. One observer found Frederick Town and Hagar's Town, as well as other frontier communities, peopled chiefly by Germans and Irish. His comments on these people are trenchant and unfriendly. According to him the Irish could scarcely speak English and the Germans only understand "high dutch." While German industry and hard work overcame the wilderness and improved the countryside beyond belief, the people lacked all sense of social life and all refinement. They were, he averred, "more like brutes than men."[44] Even if allowance is made for the fact that Smyth was reminiscing rather than recording on-the-spot observations, these frontiersmen may have been quite rude and unrefined. The exigencies of frontier life were their first and probably their only concern; the struggle with nature and the aborigines was so urgent and absorbing that the niceties of life were lost sight of or had never come within their purview. At that, however, did they differ materially from their counterparts in the European countries from which they had migrated to North America?

---

[43] Gordon, *Pennsylvania*, p. 571.

[44] J. F. D. Smyth, *A Tour in the United States of America*, pp. 257-58. London, 1784.

Almost from their inception Pennsylvania and Philadelphia were cosmopolitan in population and catholic in religion. Of racial stocks, we have seen, the English and German predominated, the former in the capital and in Bucks and Chester counties, the latter in Lancaster, York, and Northampton counties. In addition there were Welsh, French, Scottish, Dutch, Irish, Swedes, Jews, and Negroes. To dismiss all of the racial minorities as inconsequential, as has been done, is both arbitrary and contrary to fact. In religion the English were classified as Quakers, Episcopalians, Baptists, and Methodists; and the Germans as Lutherans, Reformed, Moravians, and Mennonites. Among both of these major groups, as well as in the lesser groups, there were Catholics.

What was the population of Philadelphia when the Declaration of Independence was given to the world? Uncertainty, exaggeration, and contradiction mark the estimates of travelers and diarists. We have already cited M'Roberts, who in 1775 noted that the city "was said" to contain 40,000 inhabitants.[45] This figure appears much too large because it greatly exceeds an official figure for 1777, when, thanks to the British occupation under Lord Howe, we are given an official census for Philadelphia, the North Liberties, and Southwark.[46] This counting of heads was made shortly after the British took possession of the city, and the findings were submitted to Lord Cornwallis. The people were listed under three heads: males under 18, males over 18 and under 60, and females. Boys numbered 5,335, adult men 4,996, a total of 10,331 males; and there were 13,403 females of all ages. Thus the population totaled 23,734. The excess of females over males and of boys over men undoubtedly was due to the exodus of patriots and of men of military age when Washington abandoned the city to the victorious British. Even so, it seems unlikely that around 16,000 men could have turned refugees, the number required to bring the population up to the 40,000 given by M'Roberts. This deduction is based on the well-known fact that the average span of life in the eighteenth century, because of hardships and privations and the rather elementary state of medical science and practice, was much lower than it is today. Finally, that higher number would imply that males were twice as numerous as females, a most unlikely situation. And yet in 1781 Abbé Robin, the French army chaplain, accepted M'Roberts computation of 40,000 and added that there were at least 6,000 dwellings within the city limits.[47] The only safe conclusion seems to be that the population must have been between the minimum of 23,734 reported by the British census and the maximum of 40,000 advanced by M'Roberts and others as a popular estimate.

---

[45] M'Roberts, "Tour through Part of the Northern Provinces of America," p. 166.

[46] Christopher Marshall, *Extracts from the Diary of Christopher Marshall*, edited by William Duane, p. 299. Albany, 1877.

How many of Philadelphia's citizens were Catholics? On this point we lack the precise figures provided by the census undertaken by the British military authorities for the population as a whole. In his summation of the religious affiliation of the English and the Germans, Robert L. Brunhouse ignores Catholics altogether, an omission or oversight quite surprising, inasmuch as diverse chroniclers vouch for their presence in considerable numbers. When Abbé Robin dwelt on the Catholic element in the city, he asserted that they had two chapels, "governed by an English ex-Jesuit, and a German priest" who computed their communicants at about eleven or twelve thousand.[48] Did Robin secure his information directly from the pastors? Or did the priests give their French confrère an estimate of the Catholic population of the entire state? If there was no error or misunderstanding, the omission of Brunhouse takes on added significance. At any rate, eleven or twelve thousand Catholics in the city in 1781 appears quite improbable, because Robin adds that the Quakers constituted the largest religious denomination. How could this be if Catholics according to one calculation were one half of the population, or even one fourth according to another? In either case the ratio is abnormally high.

---

[47] Robin, *New Travels*, p. 46.

[48] *Ibid.*

Additional reason for questioning Robin's account is the fact that Barbé-Marbois the French minister takes issue with him by assigning only 7,700 Catholics to Pennsylvania and Maryland combined in 1785, only four years after the French chaplain was in Philadelphia.[49] It is inconceivable that the Catholic population of the metropolis declined to such a degree in so few years. Comments to that effect are nowhere to be found in the current diaries and journals. Above all, the correspondence and records of the clergy contain no hint of such a reduction in the number of their communicants. Assuredly they would have regarded it as a disaster. These variations and discrepancies render the ascertaining of the Catholic population more difficult.

Even the census of 1790, the first census undertaken by the United States government, throws only a faint light on our problem, for it withholds what we should like to know about the relative strength of the many denominations in Pennsylvania and its capital city; but it does confirm the contention of travelers and diarists that people of English and German stock were nearly equal in number and that they exceeded the others by a very wide margin.[50] Using modern terms for elucidation, Brunhouse breaks down the total Irish population into two components of

---

[49] Robert S. Brunhouse, *The Counter Revolution in Pennsylvania*, p. 234 note. Harrisburg, 1942. Quoting Marbois to Vergennes, March 27, 1785, in George Bancroft, *The History of the Formation of the Constitution of the United States*, Vol. 1, p. 421. 2 vols. New York, 1882.

[50] Brunhouse, *Counter Revolution*, p. 2; Report of Committee on Linguistic and National Stocks, *American Historical Association Report for 1931*, Vol. 1, pp. 124-25.

46,571 from Ulster and 14,818 from the Irish Free State.[51] But, after all, on the strength of contemporary evidence the Catholics of Pennsylvania were of German and English, not of Irish, ancestry. Moreover, since this census was compiled nine years after Yorktown, its usefulness in determining figures for the period of the Revolution is limited and only indirect.

It may be that vital statistics can shed light on our problem, and bring us a step closer to its solution. Hence we turn to them as last resort. But even here we are handicapped by lack of completely satisfactory data, inasmuch as the records of burials in Philadelphia cover the period from 1765 to 1774,[52] and must be

---

[51] Pennsylvania Population—1790

English	149,151	35.3 per cent
Scotch	36,410	8.6 per cent
Irish—Ulster	46,571	11 per cent
Free State	14,818	3.5 per cent
German	140,983	33.3 per cent
Dutch	7,500	1.8 per cent
French	7,500	1.8 per cent
Swedish	3,325	.8 per cent
Unassigned	16,815	3.9 per cent

Brunhouse, *Counter Revolution*, p. 2.

[52] Burials in Philadelphia, 1765-1774

Year	1765	1766	1767	1768	1769
Roman Catholic	51	32	35	26	52
Totals	1273	943	838	801	1160
Catholic percentage	4.01	3.39	4.17	3.24	4.48

Year	1770	1771	1772	1773	1774
Roman Catholic	31	39	47	53	39
Totals	971	1007	1273	1402	1012
Catholic percentage	3.19	3.87	3.69	3.78	3.85

Totals

Total burials	10,680
Roman Catholic	405
Catholic percentage	3.69

Ibid. and St. Joseph's parish records.

supplemented by the more comprehensive records of Saint Joseph's for this period and for the war years, 1776 to 1781. Since they are listed under two headings, burials and burials of Catholics, we can reach a percentage basis and, with this as a denominator, in a tentative manner we may perhaps infer the ratio of Catholics to the whole population of the city.

At first glance we observe that the high for burials was attained in 1773, 1772, and 1765, and the high for Catholics occurred in 1773, 1769, and 1765. The Catholic low of 26 was in 1768, which was also low mark for burials in general. The ratio for Catholics to the general total ranges from 3.19 in 1770 to a high point of 4.48 in 1769, the percentage for the entire decade being 3.69. Application of this yardstick as basis for computation indicates that, if Philadelphia had 24,000 inhabitants, the official British census figure, there were around 960 Catholics in the city, whereas if 40,000 is accepted, they should have been just in excess of 1,500.

While 405 Catholics were consigned to their graves between 1765 and 1774, 1191 were ushered into life and baptized at St. Joseph's Church between 1771 and 1778. Thus the Catholic community was augmented by 786 souls.[53] During the war years, 1776-1781, there were 891 baptisms, an annual average of 148.5. Every student of the period knows that, while a high birth rate prevailed, it was countered by a mortality rate likewise high. And we have recently witnessed the phenomenon of an upsurge in births on the eve of war and in its early stages, and a decline as the war dragged on and many hundreds of men were killed or separated from home and family. In this respect 1776 parallels recent developments, inasmuch as 1776, with 203 baptisms, exceeded all the years from 1758 to 1781 by a wide margin, whereas 1780 touched a low of 114. In point of national origin, just as one should expect, those who were baptized were of German, English, Irish, and French extraction, in that order.

---

[53] Baptisms in St. Joseph's Church: 1771, 109; 1772, 134; 1773, 124; 1774, 162; 1775, 165; 1776, 203; 1777, 148; 1778, 146; 1779, 148; 1780, 114; 1781, 132. Total, 1776-1781, 891; Annual average, 148.5. Woodstock College manuscript.

Father Farmer's marriage register, continued by others after his death, records a total of 147 marriages during the war years, an annual average of 24.5. There were 26 marriages in 1776; 24 in 1777; 24 in 1778; 22 in 1779; 25 in 1780; and 26 in 1781. Again the variation is slight, ranging from 26 in 1776 and 1781 to 22 in 1779.[54] We must bear in mind that early marriage was quite the rule, as was remarriage of the survivor if either party succumbed in early or middle life. In such instances love had perforce a large ingredient of economics in the form of companionship and the care or support of the children of the deceased. Whatever the ratio of births and marriages to population, it holds for normal times, but war is the negation of normalcy. And for this reason such statistics are of limited helpfulness, for the period under consideration was one of warfare, of conflict between England and America, of internecine combat between patriot and loyalist or Tory. In the end, then, we are forced to the reluctant conclusion that it is not possible to fix the Catholic population of Pennsylvania in 1776-1781 with certainty or precision. To the query "How many were there?" truth and candor alike demand the admission "We do not know." Hence it is equally impossible to determine the precise number of Catholics who saw service in the Pennsylvania militia or in the renowned Pennsylvania Line.

---

[54] Father Farmer's Marriage Records, Woodstock College manuscript.

CHAPTER VI

A Presbyterian* War?

Now that the pertinent phases of the religious climate of the colonies have been determined, we have some understanding of how difficult the choice of sides would be for Catholics. To evaluate their decision and its import we must also learn how the men and women of that day looked upon the conflict. Were even patriots of one mind as to the causes and objectives of the war, unanimous, or nearly so, in their attitude and convictions? Was there only one objective? Was there anything in addition to what the preceding chapters reveal to give a Catholic pause, perhaps even to dissuade him from associating with the patriots? To the American schoolboy today, and to his parents as well, the American Revolution has taken on a very definite character—it was the war for independence, an uprising against British tyranny and oppression, a heroic struggle for political liberty. And so the inference is logical that simple love of liberty fired the hearts and souls of all the men who shouldered arms and of the women who urged their sons or husbands to enlistment and active participation. Is this an oversimplification? Does it take into consideration all aspects of the situation and read correctly the motivation of all participants, or does it ignore an angle of some importance? Perhaps we are so far removed from those days that some phases of the conflict have been obscured by time or forgotten altogether; perhaps a false patriotism has tricked us into ignoring what we find unpleasant or seemingly discreditable.

---

* By now the reader should realize that the Revolution generation did not customarily distinguish between Presbyterians and Congregationalists as we do. This chapter affords abundant evidence of their practice. Moreover, although there was no bishop of the Church of England resident in America till after the Revolution, adherents of that creed were called Episcopalians, not Anglicans. We may not arbitrarily tamper with their way of speaking and writing to bring it into conformity with current usage.

Do contemporaries tell us that to a man dedication to civil liberty was the inspiration of Americans in 1776, or do some of them insist that in the minds of not a few the war from its outbreak had definitely a religious overtone and motivation; specifically, that in some quarters it was hailed as a crusade in behalf of the Presbyterian creed? Such a suggestion may horrify those who have been reared on the writings of the "patriotic school" of historians; but scholars might suspect the likelihood that the definite pattern of thought engendered in the era of the French and Indian wars would naturally be projected into this clash of arms. For the decades of actual or impending war with the Catholic French in Canada and the ceaseless harping on the association of religion and politics brought it about that not a few colonists became adept in discovering a religious aspect to every undertaking or conflict, and stressed it to the belittling, if not the exclusion, of political and economic factors. Instances of this mentality and penchant have been cited already. There were, for example, the motto on the flag of the New England forces that undertook the reduction of Louisburg in King George's War, and the antics of Parson Moody, and the earnest prayers of his invalid wife. For such as they, what was in reality a war for territory and power assumed the character of a crusade against Catholics, and by indirection, for the triumph and extension of their own creed.

And the common folk were not alone in this persuasion; for the clergy, notably Charles Chauncy and Jonathan Mayhew—to mention only two—thought along the same lines and were not hesitant about expressing themselves. Moses Tyler was tempted to brand as "maniacal ravings" outbursts such as those of Mayhew; but in extenuation he offered the explanation that in Mayhew's day questions of state and of church were hopelessly blended and jumbled together, with the consequence that this doughty Puritan warrior may well have persuaded himself that in execrating the Church of Rome and its members he was battling for civil liberty. Moreover, it is admitted that these ministers were only expressing the sentiments of multitudes of "rational" contemporaries.[1] How obsessed a man could become with respect to the furtherance of his own religious beliefs is, as already mentioned, revealed by Mayhew's bold venture in forecasting the expansion of Congregationalism beyond the boundaries of New England. In this frame of mind Mayhew, or anyone entertaining like sentiments, could readily convince himself that even the American Revolution was a means of attaining this end, a step towards its realization; in other words, that the war was somehow a religious project.

In 1864 J. T. Headley protested that despite the numberless books on the American Revolution one feature has been generally neglected: "I mean the religious element."[2] To him, however, this religious element was simply the role of the New England clergy in bringing on the conflict and in seeing it to a successful conclusion. Quite correctly he argued that their ardent support must be reckoned so important a factor that it should be acknowledged by historians. As is evident, Headley's words fall far short of saying that the Revolution was no more than a Presbyterian war.

But in 1912 the English Cardinal Gasquet was more explicit when he asserted that "the American Revolution was not a movement for civil and religious liberty; its principal cause was the bigoted rage of the American Puritan and Presbyterian ministers at the concession of full religious liberty and equality to Catholics of French Canada. The Taxation Acts were only a minor cause, or rather occasion, and the dispute could have been settled by constitutional agitation without secession but for the Puritan firebrands and the bigotry of the people."[3] In these words he lays responsibility for the rupture at the doorstep of Puritan and Presbyterian ministers and their congregations, and labels the war a distinctively Presbyterian undertaking. Some may dissent from his evaluation of the causes of the Revolution, while others may be tempted to dismiss his appraisal as that of a man not too well informed on American affairs or biased in his judgment of an event so distressing to British pride and prestige. After all Gasquet's forte was not American history.

---

[1] Tyler, *Literary History*, Vol. 1, p. 134.

[2] J. T. Headley, *The Chaplains and Clergy of the Revolution*, p. 13. New York, 1864.

At least partial endorsement of Gasquet was offered the following year when Claude H. Van Tyne of the University of Michigan, a foremost authority on the Revolution, contributed an article to the *American Historical Review* in which he charged that the "historical muse has been too much of a worldling, and has worshipped too partially the golden calf of economic causes."[4] While Van Tyne would not go so far as to argue that the Revolution was a "holy war" or even that religious prejudice and the dissenting clergy were the dominant factors, he sided rather definitely with his British colleague when he concluded that "among the many causes I rate religious bigotry, sectarian antipathy, and the influence of the Calvinistic clergy among the most important."[5] It does no undue violence to Van Tyne to interpret his words as qualified assent to the idea of a war Presbyterian in character.

---

[3] *The Tablet*, London, Vol. 120, July 20, 27, 1912. Gasquet is not to be regarded as an authority on American history, but he testifies to the persistence of this belief.

[4] Clyde H. Van Tyne, "The Influence of the Clergy and Sectarian Forces in the American Revolution," *American Historical Review*, Vol. 19, October 1913.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 64.

By approaching the subject from a different angle Arthur Cross, a colleague of Van Tyne, arrived at the conclusion that religious differences were not a prime cause, but an effect, of political alienation of the colonies from Britain; but it must be remembered that he had explored a different theme, colonial opposition to the introduction of an Anglican episcopate, and that he had this controversy in mind rather than the Revolution itself.[6] As a matter of fact, then, he neither affirms nor denies the dictum of Gasquet.

Finally, in his presidential address at the convention of the American Historical Association in Boston in 1930, Evarts B. Greene of Columbia University averred that in the political antagonisms of the pre-Revolution period "religion played a minor, but not quite negligible part," and he instances the exploiting by Whig propagandists of dread of an American episcopate and the Quebec Act. Although Greene says nothing about the Presbyterian involvement in the Revolution, it would be rash to infer from his mere silence that he contradicted Gasquet. It is apparent that further investigation is in order.

In point of fact, distrust and dislike between those in America who were somewhat loosely styled Presbyterians or Congregationalists and the British government and the Established Church were of long standing. Presbyterians and Congregationalists were convinced that without a shred of evidence the authorities deemed them potential plotters and rebels, just because of their creed; and in turn they never gave full trust to those whose good will and sincerity they called into question. This divergence of mind was in large measure a legacy from Cromwell's days, for to a royalist the memory of the deposition and execution of Charles

---

[6] Arthur L. Cross, *The Anglican Episcopacy and the American Revolution*, p. 271. New York, 1902.

I and the overthrow of monarchical government was ineffaceable, while the descendants of Cromwell's soldiers and coreligionists nursed real or fancied wrongs inflicted by royal government. Since the bitter feeling was reciprocal, it showed little sign of waning and of giving way to a better understanding. Each party was convinced of its own righteousness and of the other's malevolence. An iron curtain hung between the two. Then, too, Presbyterians linked royal government with an established church not of their liking, and Episcopalians associated Presbyterians with rebellion, persecution, and fanatical enthusiasm. Always latent since the Restoration in 1660, as tension mounted over political issues between London and the American colonies and relations deteriorated, these convictions and fears struck deeper roots and took on new life. Under the circumstances undue significance would be attached to rumor, and trifling incidents would be distorted to suit the individual's preconceptions.

There is evidence that before the Declaration of Independence some British authorities in America entertained doubts as to the loyalty of certain Presbyterians, suspected them of plotting, and thought it advisable to keep them under rather close surveillance. Thus, as early as 1776 General Gage reported to the secretary of state that the "Presbyterians in Pennsylvania are as ripe for outrage as they can be."[7] In like manner, in May 1775 he had warned Governor Legge of Halifax that among the emigrants from Boston to Halifax there was a Mr. Moward, reputedly a Presbyterian minister "bent on mischief," whom Legge would do well to seize as an example "to deter others from like treasonable practices."[8] In his reply, dated Halifax, June 26, 1775, Governor Legge apprised Gage that Moward had arrived at Annapolis "with many of the followers." In conformity with

---

[7] Clarence E. Carter, *Correspondence of General Thomas Gage with Secretaries of State, 1763-1775*, Vol. 1, p. 82. 2 vols. New Haven, 1931-1933.

[8] *Gage Papers*, American Series in the William Clements Library.

Gage's advice Legge had ordered him to repair to Halifax, where he was examined by the council, to whom he presented official papers that authorized a leave of absence. From this Legge inferred that the clergyman had given Gage assurance in regard to his future conduct, which must have included a "dutiful submission to Government and the taking of the oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy." This should suffice.

Gage's attitude was no secret, and it elicited repercussions. At the same time that Gage advocated the apprehension of Moward, a man in Philadelphia notified a friend in London that Gage had imprisoned a certain Lieutenant Fowler just "because he was a Presbyterian."[9] Simultaneously a surgeon of the British fleet in Boston classified the American forces that besieged Boston as "a drunken, canting, lying, praying, hyppocritical rabble" doomed to disintegrate, "the descendants of Oliver Cromwell's army."[10] With such a pedigree, if the estimate was exact, it should follow that these warriors would conclude that they were engaged in the defense of their religion precisely as their forefathers had been; that the conflict was definitely a Presbyterian war against New England's two outstanding foes, episcopacy and papacy.[11] Thacker's sentiments were shared by another New England crusader for Jehovah, Daniel Barber, who added his testimony to the widespread character of this persuasion but accented the anti-Catholic motivation of the New England recruits.[12] And the fact that almost to a man the New England clergy espoused the Whig cause lent color to suspicions of the British civil and military authorities,[13] and gave pause to Nicholas Collin, a Swedish Lutheran minister who was averse to urging the people to revolt.[14] To enkindle enthusiasm in so worthy a cause a "Son of Liberty," in camp on Prospect Hill, elaborated "A New Liberty Song" which exhorted patriots to oppose their inveterate foes and reject their "insidious advances." The same tenor and purpose permeated a manifesto entitled "Americans to Arms" issued at Watertown right after Bunker Hill—Americans were battling for their religion as well as their liberty, hence they were involved in a religious war.[15] Very shortly a similar exhortation apostrophized "Baltimore's Loved Sons" who, in emulation of their forebears, had set themselves the task of upholding their religion and liberty.[16] In these individuals' minds the war bore a very definite religious cast, and by inference it was a Presbyterian venture.

---

[9] Willard, *Letters*, p. 315.

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 120.

[11] James Thacker, *Military Journal during the American Revolutionary War, from 1775-1783*, pp. 17, 23. Boston, 1823.

[12] Daniel Barber, *The History of My Own Times*, p. 17. Washington, 1827.

[13] Ramsay, *American Revolution*, pp. 312-13.

For a number of reasons Ambrose Serle must be deemed eminently qualified to pass judgment on the character of the American Revolution. In the first place his Calvinistic inclinations and sympathy would soften his judgment of Congregationalists and Presbyterians and incline him to leniency; at the very least he would not be biased and harsh. In addition he was secretary to Admiral Lord Richard Howe from 1776 to 1778, during which time his control of the press of New York gave him opportunity to keep his finger on the public pulse and to gauge trends; later he was secretary to Lord Dartmouth, secretary of state for the colonies. In each office he had access to a fund of information from a variety of sources, such as official and secret reports, the correspondence of spies and Anglophiles, captured dispatches, orders and letters; and his personal correspondents were numerous. Thus he enjoyed singular opportunity to read the public mind. With good reason does the *Dictionary of National Biography* say that "his knowledge of American affairs was considerable and his letters throw much light on the course of events." He appears to have been intelligent, observant, discreet, and slow to judge the conflict in which he found himself embroiled. On August 24, 1776, while still aboard the *Eagle* in the waters off Staten Island before the invasion of Long Island, he deplored the loss to England of so much man power and wealth through the large-scale emigration from Belfast to America,[17] a situation we shall consider in another chapter. By November he advised Lord Dartmouth that "at Boston the war is very much a religious war";[18] and in April 1777 he apprised the same official that "Presbyterianism is really at the Bottom of the whole conspiracy, has supplied it with Vigor, and will never rest, till something is decided upon it."[19] However reluctant this conclusion because it was an indictment of people of his own creed, it was his final verdict. Horace Walpole entertained the same view, for he remarked facetiously that "Daughter America has run off with a Presbyterian Parson."[20]

---

[14] Amandus Johnson, *The Journal and Biography of Nicholas Collin, 1746-1831*, p. 238. Philadelphia, 1936.

[15] Massachusetts Historical Society Broadside, 1775.

[16] *Dunlap's Maryland Gazette*, June 27, 1775.

Another witness whose integrity could not be impugned was the Reverend Daniel Barber, at this time minister in Claremont, New Hampshire, but some four decades later a convert to Catholicism. When the war broke out he enlisted in the company of Captain Elisha Humphrey and hurried off to Boston. He testifies that the men in his group were convinced that King George was a traitor, a perjuror, and secretly a papist. "The real fear of popery," he writes, "stimulated many people to send their sons to join the ranks. The common word then was:

---

[17] Ambrose Serle, *American Journal of Ambrose Serle*, edited by Edward H. Tatum, Jr. San Marino, 1940.

[18] Clarence Lundin, *Cockpit of the Revolution*, p. 99. Princeton, 1940 (quoting Serle).

[19] Guy S. Klett, editor, *The Presbyterian Church and Our National Foundation*, p. 17. Philadelphia, 1937 (quoting a letter from Ambrose Serle to the Earl of Dartmouth).

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 100.

'No King, no Popery'."[21] If words have meaning, Barber tells us that to many a New Englander this was a war to defend New England's Protestantism, it was a Presbyterian war. But one of the hallmarks of human nature is inconsistency—the unity and harmony of New England Protestants and southern Catholics assembled about Boston gratified Barber.

The men from Maryland and Pennsylvania, and in particular the Catholics, might well have been thunderstruck when they arrived at Boston and learned that New Englanders looked upon the war as a crusade in defense of their own creed. Well might morale have suffered a rude shock. For in Pennsylvania, as Alexander Graydon acquaints us, the puritanical spirit was unknown, religious homogeneity such as obtained in New England nonexistent, and consequently promotional efforts based on a sectarian appeal must be ineffective in exciting enthusiasm or stimulating enlistment. In Pennsylvania soldiers could not be made into crusaders according to a denominational pattern, but must be taken as they were, of mixed creed or no creed.[22]

Despite Graydon, however, even in Pennsylvania the opinion of Ambrose Serle did find an echo, notably in Thomas Smith of Upper Wakefield in Bucks County. When arraigned before local authorities, Smith at first denied most of the charges against him, but under the pressure of cross-examination of himself and witnesses his courage melted and he made incriminating admissions. At any rate, the committee ordered the publication of his confession "that the whole war was nothing but a scheme of a parcel of hot-headed Presbyterians, and that he believed the Devil was at the bottom of the whole."[23] How the religiously tolerant people of Pennsylvania reacted to Smith's allegation is not recorded.

---

[21] Barber, *History*, p. 17.

[22] Alexander Graydon, *Memoirs of His Own Times*, edited by John S. Littell, pp. 137-38. Philadelphia, 1846.

[23] Wilbur H. Siebert, *The Loyalists of Pennsylvania*, p. 26. Columbus, 1905.

Still another who subscribed to Serle's estimate of the war was a Nicholas Cresswell, who denounced "the Rascally Presbyterian clergy" as the prime instigators and supporters of the "unnatural Rebellion." Because of their involvement in politics and the "prostitution of their sacred function" he found it impossible to consider them "Divine teachers, or Godly teachers." Among their misdeeds he listed their endeavor to persuade their credulous flocks that the king had turned papist and that his outraged subjects would rise in revolt and cut off his head. Furthermore, such men of the cloth sought to convince the simple multitude that an international host, headed by the kings of France and Spain, the pope, the Pretender, the king of Prussia, and the Grand Turk, would invade England to succor the king's Protestant subjects; that the sequel to their success would be the deposition of the empress of Russia, the prince of Hesse, and other princes who had aided Great Britain, and the partitioning of their dominions among the European powers friendly disposed towards the "virtuous Americans."[24] But one can scarcely credit the clergy of New England with such devices; for, while human credulity is proverbially great, it still has limits. It is simply inconceivable that, indoctrinated as New Englanders were since childhood with the belief that the pope and the Pretender, and the kings of France and Spain no less, were the mortal enemies of Protestantism, they should now persuade themselves that of a sudden these enemies were converted, that they should espouse the cause of Protestantism, and be eager to fight in behalf of Calvinism. Would New England ministers be so obtuse as to cherish the notion that they could quickly effect such a radical change in the mentality of those they addressed? Besides, on its face, a common enterprise of this nature was utterly absurd.

---

[24] Cresswell, *Journal*, pp. 260-61.

Associated with Serle and Cresswell in their estimate of the character of the war was Thomas Anburey, a Convention prisoner, who thought that in New England the war had become in some measure a "religious cause," and he arraigned the clergy of that area for capitalizing on this belief in order to intensify war spirit in their parishioners. One of them in Cambridge, in Anburey's hearing, stooped to the most blatant fraud, inasmuch as he assured his audience that heaven held special rewards for those who fell in the cause—a favorite and effective argument for deluding the ignorant, adds Anburey. Moreover, pretending to have been favored with assurance by the Supreme Being, the minister averred that only those "would be accepted in Heaven, who should seal their lives in so righteous a cause with their blood." And Anburey suspected that "similar doctrine is doubtless made use of by their clergy in general"; they fostered the idea of a religious war, a Presbyterian war.[25]

One of the features of the American Revolution was the employment by Britain of German mercenaries, usually styled Hessians, although in reality they hailed from various German principalities. Delivered by their rulers as cannon fodder on an ascending scale of recompense depending on whether they escaped injury, were wounded, or died, they were made convenient scapegoats on which to pin atrocities or defeats. Hitherto their experience had been limited to service in Europe; America was new, strange, refreshing. Why should they continue to risk life and limb in a contest in which they had neither personal nor national interest? Small wonder that desertion was common, especially after capture or when they found themselves in German-speaking areas in Pennsylvania. It may have been simple nostalgia or some obscure urge; but at all events they were industrious letter writers. The William Clements Library of the University of Michigan has acquired thousands of their letters which recount experiences and impressions. In this respect Captain Johann Heinrichs of the Hessian Jaeger Corps excelled, as his letter book bears witness. By January 1778, after two years in the country, he concluded that the war was "nothing more or less than an Irish-Scotch Presbyterian Rebellion."[26] And in mid-July of the same year, in a report to the honorable counselor of the court, whom he addressed as "dearest friend," he protested: "Call this war . . . by whatsoever name you may, only call it not an American Rebellion; it is nothing more or less than an Irish-Scotch Presbyterian Rebellion." One's reliance on Heinrichs as observer and witness is somewhat shaken, however, when to Presbyterians he links Quakers as prime movers of rebellion and rivals in duplicity and hypocrisy. According to Heinrichs the "first ones" in Pennsylvania and Philadelphia and Boston are, properly speaking, the heads of the rebellion. Virginia is given no credit.[27]

---

[25] Anburey, *Travels*, Vol. 2, p. 29.

Like so many contemporaries, the Philadelphia Quaker Samuel Rowland Fisher confided his thoughts to a journal. Aroused, it may be by rumors of how Boston reacted to the presence of the French forces, in 1779 or 1780 he penned his reflections on the current state of affairs, the forces at work, and recognizable trends, and in good Quaker fashion he appended a moral deduction. As he saw it, there was throughout America a general debasement of principles in all religious societies, but in none except the "Presbyterians" had the clergy had a hand in shaping political developments. For a long while and in great secrecy Presbyterians had plotted the establishment of their religious and political ideals, unhampered by king or royal government. On their consciences, therefore, rested the guilt of involving the colonies in the present calamities, but in pursuing their designs they had overreached themselves and lost both credit and character in the estimation of all other Protestants by building an altar in one of their meetinghouses and having a popish Mass "performed."[28] Did Fisher have a special incident in mind, or was he relying on rumor? At any rate, his assurance that the war bore a Presbyterian impress is obvious.

---

[26] "Extracts from the Letter Book of Captain Johann Heinrichs of the Hessian Jaeger Corps, 1778-1780," translated by Julius F. Sachse, *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, Vol. 22, number 2, p. 137, July 1898.

[27] *Ibid.*

A minor but still far from negligible figure in the American Revolution was François Marquis de Barbé-Marbois, who enjoyed special opportunities for learning the mind of America, whose cause he had embraced. Two of his comments on Boston corroborate the evidence of other observers.[29,30] After deliberation on the situation he concluded that a number of highly placed persons had come to regard religion as a political instrument. Without identifying any of them, he added that most of the Presbyterian ministers had plunged headlong into politics and distinguished themselves in promoting the Revolution.[31] The identity of one of these clerical politicians was revealed by Claude Blanchard, commissary of the French forces in America, and the accuracy of the characterization is beyond question. Blanchard pays tribute to the great influence of Doctor Cooper over the inhabitants of Boston, who, as devout Presbyterians, were imbued with the principles of Cromwell's followers, whose descendants they were. By reason of this spiritual and blood lineage they surpassed all others in their attachment to their beliefs, and it was they who began the Revolution, presumably on some religious motivation.[32]

---

[28] Anna W. Morris, editor, "The Journal of Samuel Rowland Fisher," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, Vol. 41, pp. 178-79, 1917.

[29] "The Presbyterians should not be allowed to grow too strong. They are all of Republican Principles. The Bostonians are Presbyterians" (Philip Francis, *The Sir Philip Francis Letters*, Vol. 1, p. 99. [2 vols. New York, 1901.] Macrabie to Sir Philip Francis).

[30] "In Boston they are rank presbyterians, of this sort of people preserve me, O Lord!" (Quoted by Van Tyne in *The Causes of the War of Independence*, p. 346. [New York, 1922] from *Journal of Travel in the American Colonies, July 9, 1765*, manuscript in *Paris Archives Service Hydrographic de la Marine*, Vol. 76, number 2).

[31] Barbé-Marbois, François de, *Our Revolutionary Forefathers—Letters of François, Marquis de Barbé-Marbois, 1779-1785*, p. 71. New York, 1929.

Still another Frenchman, Abbé Claude Robin, touched on the ascendancy of "Presbyterians" in Boston, their deep-seated hostility to the Catholic faith, and their credulity in respect to that faith and those who professed it. Robin, however, laid the blame at England's door because for decades she had disseminated lies and misrepresentation of Catholics in America and had exulted in their acceptance.[33] She now reaped the harvest of this planting.

So much for foreign observers. What did native Tories conceive to be the root causes and very nature of the Revolution? Did they look upon it as a purely political affair or did it assume in their estimation the character of a religious war, a Presbyterian crusade in origin and objective? Two of them are particularly emphatic in indicting the Presbyterians for warmongering, and both were persons of standing. Samuel Cooper, president of King's College, gave vent to his convictions in an incisive pamphlet, *A Friendly Address to all Reasonable Americans on the Subject of Our Present Political Confusion*, and he did not mince his words. The patriots he branded "hair-brained fanatics, as mad and distracted as the Anabaptists of Munster." Could it be possible that leaders such as these had elicited the approval and support of the colonists? And if the colonists elsewhere also think of embracing such a cause, it could be due only to infatuation and blindness, clearly the judgment of God. To risk everything they treasured to uphold "a few Presbyterians and Independents" was so fatuous that in moments of calm reflection it must be rejected with abhorrence.[34] One cannot escape the conclusion that Cooper entertained no doubt whatever that the war wore the hallmark of Presbyterianism.

---

[32] Blanchard, *Journal*, p. 50.

[33] Robin, *New Travels*, p. 19.

[34] Samuel Cooper, *A Friendly Address to All Reasonable Americans on the Subject of Our Present Political Confusion*, p. 31. New York, 1774.

And Charles Inglis, the rector of Trinity Church in New York and reputed author of the *Letters of Papinian* addressed to the American people at large or to such individuals as Henry Laurens, the president of Congress, and to John Adams, concluded Number 5 of the series with the bold declaration that, despite the opinion of some to the contrary, "it is absolutely certain, that on the part of many, the present is a Religious War."[35] We submit that, since it could not possibly be a war for popery or the Established Church, it must of necessity be a war for Presbyterianism. As basis for his conviction Inglis advanced the fact that in a Presbyterian synod, where most of the ministers of the middle colonies assembled, they resolved to support the Continental Congress in all its measures. This explained their uniformity of conduct. Besides inquiry did not disclose even one who by preaching and personal effort did not promote those measures "however extravagant."[36]

Modern scholarship accepts the estimate of Inglis, and explains the uniformity of thought and unanimity in conduct by the fact that, when the Revolution broke out, the Presbyterians in the colonies were in large measure Scotch-Irish from North Ireland, still burning with hostility to England over the wrongs which had caused them to emigrate to America.[37] Confirmation is found in the remark of Joseph Galloway in 1774 that the chief opponents of the British government were "Congregationalists, Presbyterians and smugglers," a cavalier *bon mot* indeed.[38] Another scholar brings forward the pastoral letter of 1783 drawn up by a committee consisting of John Witherspoon, Elihu Spencer, and Samuel Smith and approved by the synod of New York and Philadelphia. This document exults over the fact that the almost universal attachment of the Presbyterian body was recognized and resented by the enemy. This circumstance is reason for rejoicing, gives credit to the body, and augments their gratitude for the happy issue of the war. Had it been otherwise, they should have drunk deeply of the cup of suffering; but even so, the burning and destruction of their churches and the plunder of their dwellings where the enemy prevailed only temporarily indicates what would have ensued had they triumphed.[39] Still another apologist raises the question whether any ministers equaled the Presbyterians or whether any church suffered so much as the Presbyterian.[40]

---

[35] [Inglis], *Papinian*, number V, p. 78.

[36] Klett, *Presbyterian Church*, p. 17 (quoting *The Documentary History of the State of New York*, Chap. 3, pp. 1050-51. [Albany, 1850]).

[37] A distinction is made here between Presbyterians and Congregationalists, a distinction somewhat unusual at the time. "So far as Pennsylvania was concerned the revolution was three fourths at least a Presbyterian [Scotch-Irish] movement" (Wayland F. Dunaway, *The Scotch-Irish of Colonial Pennsylvania*, p. 157. [Chapel Hill, 1944] quoting Isaac Sharpless, "Presbyterian and Quaker in Colonial Pennsylvania," *Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society*, Vol. 3, p. 212).

Finally, John Adams might be listed as witness to the current belief in the politico-religious character of the war, but this testimony is less direct, and so belated that it might be regarded as suspect on the score that it is mere reminiscence. In a letter to Reverend Doctor Jedidiah Morse, dated December 2, 1815, he laments the current religious decadence, and asks whether in that day when we see "Methodistical Bishops, Bishops of the Church of England, and Bishops, Archbishops, and Jesuits of the Church of Rome with indifference," any man could be persuaded that fifty years previous fear of episcopacy could arouse the common people as well as the "inquiring mind" fully as much as any other cause. Obviously episcopacy is his theme, but he testifies to the involvement of religious issues in the war, even if he does not incriminate the Presbyterians directly.[41]

---

[38] Klett, *Presbyterian Church*, p. 259.

[39] C. A. Briggs, *American Presbyterianism*, p. 357. New York, 1885 (quoting Klett).

[40] Allen Brown, *An Outline History of the Presbyterian Church in West and South Jersey from 1700-1865*, p. 36. Philadelphia, 1869.

To what extent did the labeling of the Revolution a Presbyterian war stem from the presence in Congress of John Witherspoon, the distinguished president of the College of New Jersey and one of the most prominent Presbyterians of the country? By 1777 Governor John Wentworth of New Hampshire styled him a leader of "the anti-British side."[42] And in Horace Walpole's witticism about daughter America eloping with a Presbyterian parson the reference must be to Witherspoon. One of his biographers holds that both abroad and at home he was largely credited with molding public opinion and shaping events in the months before the Declaration of Independence.[43] So generally was he associated with public affairs that the vitriolic Tory writer Reverend Jonathan Odell paid him the compliment of five stanzas in his satire "The American Times."[44] Witherspoon's services were varied; his influence was heightened by his fluency in French and his sterling character.

It might be objected that much of the evidence we have assembled is unconvincing because it is drawn from sources of questionable knowledge and impartiality. The inability of Europeans to understand America, and their proneness to snap judgments after a brief sojourn are proverbial. How could foreigners —an Englishman such as Ambrose Serle, or Nicholas Collin the recent Swedish immigrant, or the Hessian Captain Heinrichs, or the Frenchmen Barbé-Marbois, Blanchard, Robin, or Anburey the prisoner—arrive at an accurate estimate of a land and a people so dissimilar to their own? As rejoinder it might be urged that, as these men echoed the sentiments of the circles in which they moved, it follows that the involvement of Presbyterians was regarded as established fact by the British and French. Alexander Graydon, it is true, denies that the war had a religious motif, but he is speaking of Maryland and Pennsylvania, not of New England. And Graydon is contradicted by the Quaker Fisher, who instinctively would be sensitive to a movement that conflicted with his religious convictions and his business interests. Whatever point there is in this objection is blunted by the "New Liberty Song" already mentioned, which originated in the camp at Boston. In reality, conviction is established by James Melvin and James Thacker, who were patriot soldiers, and by Daniel Barber, the New England parson turned soldier. They were genuine New Englanders, of New England stock and tradition; they were not prejudiced; they had no reason to misrepresent New England's convictions and aspirations.

---

[41] Jedidiah Morse, *Annals of the American Revolution; or a Record of the Causes and Events*, pp. 197-98. Hartford, 1824.

[42] Varnum Lansing Collins, *President Witherspoon*, Vol. 2, p. 196. 2 vols. Princeton, 1925 (Stevens Facsimiles—487 Fo F° 30).

[43] Collins, *President Witherspoon*, Vol. 1, p. 183.

[44] *Ibid.*

But was not too much of the evidence garnered from private journals, diaries, and correspondence not accessible to the public at that time? Did it not originate in New England, and to a less extent in New York, and was it not therefore unknown in Maryland and Pennsylvania, where most of the Catholics were to be found? Granted that intercourse was very limited, that communication was slow and defective, and that penal laws may have made Catholics largely unlettered, Maryland was not solely dependent on the New England press for knowledge of how the war was regarded. The animadversions of the Quaker Fisher establish this fact. Moreover, Maryland had its echo, albeit a faint echo, of the spirit prevalent in New England. In June 1775 the columns of *Dunlap's Maryland Gazette* contained a bit of verse[45] which eulogized "Baltimore's Loved Sons" who drilled under the eye of men who, in boldness and bravery, were said to match British leaders of old. Making due allowance for poetic license and inexactitude, we gather that their religion was in jeopardy and needed defense, that in a sense a religious war was raging. It is wholly superfluous to observe that the religion in question was not that of the Catholics of Maryland and Pennsylvania but that of their bitter critics and opponents. This appeal was raised about the time that the regiments of Moylan and Smallwood began their march to Boston. If the Catholics in these regiments never learned of the pronunciamento of the local newspaper, a rude awakening awaited them on their arrival at New England's metropolis, where they met men fired with the crusading spirit of Daniel Barber. Would they rue their joining the colors and their relief expedition? Would they think that they had been tricked into aiding a cause which was emphatically not theirs, into helping Presbyterians to extend and establish their creed? And for those still in civil life the loose talk about a Presbyterian war would serve as an obstacle and a deterrent to their choice of the so-called patriot cause. Hesitation and doubt would have been both natural and logical. This religious angle of the war must be weighed in judging the final choice of Catholics, for in it they would discern reason for extreme caution and much misgiving.

---

[45] *Dunlaps Maryland Gazette*, June 27, 1775.

CHAPTER VII

How Numerous the Catholics?

How numerous were American Catholics during the Revolution, and what was their ratio to the total population? Answers to these questions are preliminary to an evaluation of their part in the conflict. Above all, were Catholics so large an element of the population as to constitute the potential menace their enemies judged them to be? Did their support or opposition really matter? Before we can venture an opinion we must determine the population as a whole. To do otherwise would be to treat this problem as a purely academic matter.

The first official counting of heads under federal auspices was in 1790, nearly a decade after Yorktown, during which interval the population must have increased. Figures before that date are largely estimates, frequently no more than mere guesswork. The earliest attempt to count the people in the colonies which has come to our notice took place in July 1773 when Lord Dartmouth dispatched a questionnaire to the governors of the "Colonies and islands in North America." A series of twenty inquiries ranged over boundaries, area, rivers, harbors, form of government, mineral wealth, defenses, relations with Indians, French, or Spaniards, revenue, disbursements, civil and military establishments. Number 13 reads: "What is the number of inhabitants White & Black?" It is noteworthy that only the governors of

New York, Connecticut, and New Hampshire attached sufficient importance to the request to attempt exact figures, but we may discount as official verbiage the boast of Governor Wentworth of New Hampshire of "utmost effort." No less than five of the chief executives, those of Maryland, Rhode Island, Delaware, North Carolina, and South Carolina, ignored the request, as one may infer from the absence of their reports in the Dartmouth Papers in the William Clements Library. By summing up the figures that were given we arrive at a total of 1,641,107; and if to this number we add the population of the colonies which did not report, we come to the conclusion that the population probably exceeded 2,000,000 but that it may have fallen short of 2,500,000. Although a difference of such magnitude is quite unsatisfactory no closer approximation is possible.

The next extant figures are for September 1774, after a tidal wave of immigration from North Ireland to Pennsylvania, Delaware, and South Carolina, when Ezra Stiles included in his diary "an estimate of the number of souls."[1] Although Stiles pointedly remarked that his estimate is "too large and indefinite, and no more approved by Congress than Dr. Galloway's Plan," the figures were later accepted and copied by John Drayton.[2] Again we have round numbers except for Rhode Island, whose population is given as 59,678, and once again Delaware and Georgia are omitted. One subscribes readily to the judgment of Stiles that the figures are too high, for the total is 3,026,678.[3]

In January 1775, without citing his authority, Governor Penn of Pennsylvania ascribed 302,000 (including 2,000 Negroes) to his colony,[4] and for the same year Scharf, the historian of Maryland, likewise citing no source and omitting New Jersey and Delaware, fixed the total population at 2,068,000.[5] If Patrick M'Roberts did not err in allotting only 18,000 to 20,000 inhabitants to Boston in August 1774,[6] Scharf's attribution of 352,000 to Massachusetts in 1775 must be extravagant. The calculations of Greene and Harrington, based on a study of General Clinton's public papers, arrive at a population of 2,418,000 in 1775.[7] Only in respect to Rhode Island do Greene and Harrington agree with Scharf. In general their figures are lower than those of Scharf, but they add 100,000 to Virginia, 107,000 to South Carolina, and 76,000 to Maryland. Both authorities omit Georgia, still in the first stages of colonization, and neither ventures to give precise numbers. The obvious inference is that no exact figures are obtainable, a deduction that finds confirmation in the remark of McCrady that the appointment by Congress for the several states in 1776 was based on a mere estimate "from the best calculation."[8]

---

[1] Stiles, *Literary Diary*, Vol. 1, p. 486.

[2] John Drayton, *Memoirs of American Revolution*, Vol. 1, p. 15. 2 vols. Charleston, 1821.

[3] Local attempts at census taking indicate that New York had between sixteen and seventeen thousand in 1761, Philadelphia between twenty-eight and thirty-five thousand in 1769, Newport 9,208 in 1774, and Baltimore 5,934 in 1775 (E. B. Greene and Virginia Harrington, *American Population before the Federal Census of 1790*, p. 36 note. [New York, 1932]).

Howe's capture of Philadelphia in 1778 led to a prompt exodus of patriots. When, chiefly for military purposes, he ordered a census of the inhabitants it revealed a total of 35,000 souls, 23,000 in the city proper, 2,000 in the suburbs, and 10,000 in the "Liberties."[9] By May 1778, so it was said, the return of refugees, patriots, and opportunists swelled the population to

---

[4] *Archives of the Pennsylvania Historical Society*, first series. Vol. 4, p. 597. Philadelphia, 1853.

[5] J. Thos. Scharf, *History of Maryland*, Vol. 2, p. 200. 3 vols. Baltimore, 1879.

[6] M'Roberts, "A Tour through Part of the North Provinces of America, 1774-1775," p. 151.

[7] Greene and Harrington, *American Population*, p. 7.

[8] Edward McCrady, *The History of South Carolina in the Revolution, 1775-1780*, p. 294. New York, 1901.

[9] "Journal of Captain John Montresor July 1, 1777-July 1, 1778," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, Vol. 5, number 4, p. 414, 1881. *See also* "Montresor Journals," edited by G. D. Scull, *Collections of New York Historical Society for 1881*, New York, 1882.

60,000, soldiers and seamen included.[10] That same year Boston was credited with being "among the first class of American towns" with approximately 25,000 inhabitants.[11] And three years later Abbé Claude Robin estimated that in Boston there were about 6,000 houses and 30,000 people, with no less than nineteen churches, all conveniently situated, some of them "finished with taste and elegance."[12] Robin also computed the population of Virginia at 150,000 whites and 500,000 Negroes, and to Maryland he assigned not more than 20,000 whites and at least ten times that many Negroes,[13] figures greatly in excess of the conclusion of recent investigators.[14]

Finally, to complete this somewhat wearisome but necessary discussion, in November 1781 Samuel Livermore, a member of Congress, in a letter to Mesech Weare, the president of that body, says that, while the *Journal* omits the number of inhabitants, the population was 2,420,000.[15] Conspicuous once more are the lack of explicit numbers and the omission of Georgia. Only one conclusion appears to be fully warranted, that at the outbreak of the American Revolution there must have been in the neighborhood of two-and-one-half million souls in Britain's mainland colonies, exclusive of recent acquisitions from France.

Now that we have established the approximate population in 1775, we must rivet our attention on the number of Catholics. Since Maryland and Pennsylvania were the chief Catholic centers, each will receive special consideration. For the present we limit our study to the Catholic population elsewhere and in general, for their number might influence their choice between the contending parties. In doing this we must beware of the pitfalls of depreciation and exaggeration in which some have come to grief. George Washington bore witness that Catholics did play a part in the War for Independence, an honorable and not inconspicuous part. On March 15, 1790, in replying to an "Address of Catholics," signed by John Carroll on behalf of the clergy and by Charles and Daniel Carroll of Maryland, Dominick Lynch of New York, and Thomas FitzSimmons of Pennsylvania as representatives of the laity, he observed that, as mankind grows more liberal, men will be more apt to grant that all who conduct themselves as worthy members of society are equally entitled to the protection of the civil government. He hoped, moreover, to see America among the nations foremost in justice and liberality; he assumed that their fellow citizens would always be mindful of the patriotic part which Catholics played in carrying the Revolution to a successful issue and in establishing the new federal government.[16] Now, there is not the slightest justification for regarding this as the language of political good manners, as polite but meaningless phrases. Our first president was not given to indulging in double talk.

---

[10] "Montresor Journals," p. 494.

[11] Elkanah Watson, *Men and Times of the American Revolution: Memoirs of Elkanah Watson*, edited by Winslow Watson, p. 81. New York, 1857.

[12] Robin, *New Travels*, p. 13.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 53.

[14] Greene and Harrington, *American Population*, p. 132.

[15] Burnett, *Letters*, Vol. 6, p. 257.

Despite Washington's testimony a certain John Christian, animated, one fears, by considerations other than zeal for the truth, from August 1902 to May 1903 contributed a series of fourteen articles to the *Christian Standard* on the subject of Roman Catholics in the American Revolution. In part these essays are a vitriolic attack on the Catholic Church, its creed and record; in part they attempt a refutation of the claims for Catholics put forth by Martin I. J. Griffin. While Griffin's writings are open to criticism on several counts, he must nevertheless be given credit for an honest effort to discover the truth. Not so Christian, whose articles are negative and vitriolic. Even if name calling and invective always are the weakest of replies and inconclusive,

---

[16] Fitzpatrick, *George Washington*, Vol. 31, p. 22 note.

Griffin might be excused for penciling the comment "a monstrous lie" on the margin of one newspaper clipping of an article by Christian found among his papers.

On the other hand, Catholics whose enthusiasm eclipsed their scholarship have indulged in rash and unfounded claims for their coreligionists in the Revolution. Thus, as we saw, one boasts that when the war came priests and people were among the first to sacrifice their lives and their property for the cause.[17] In reality, apart from the militia the only Catholic chaplain in the American army was a French Canadian, Reverend Louis Lotbinière, who survived the war unscathed. No Catholic chaplain died on the field of battle, or as a consequence of wounds; none languished in prison. Another enthusiast sponsors the extravagant fantasy that of the 9,000 men under Washington at Yorktown 4,000 were Catholics of French, Irish, or German descent. Absurdity is reached when he argues that, since the total Franco-American force numbered 30,000, of whom 21,000 were Catholic French soldiers and sailors, and since about 4,000 of the Americans were of the same faith, Yorktown was a Catholic achievement.[18] If, as he admits two pages later, there were at most 20,000 Catholics in the thirteen colonies, and if in addition there was "some division of opinion" among Catholics with respect to the movement for independence from British rule, the contribution of 4,000 fighting men was a feat little short of phenomenal.[19] For the total number of 20,000 included both sexes, every age, physical condition, and social status, the free and the slave, patriot and Tory. Significant too is the order in which he listed the national origin of the Catholic combatants—French, Irish, German—the exact reverse of what it should be and a strange ignoring of those of English extraction. Actually, Catholics were predominantly of English stock in Maryland, and of German ancestry in Pennsylvania, whereas the Irish were few, and the French still fewer, even if one includes the Acadian exiles, so dispirited by misfortune as to be disinclined to take up arms. Furthermore, a majority of the Maryland Catholics appear to have served in the militia.

---

[17] John T. Reily, *Conewago*, p. 48. Martinsburg, 1885.

[18] Leo G. Fink, *Old Jesuit Trails in Penn's Forest*, p. 21. New York, 1936.

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 23.

Estimates as to the number of Catholics in the British colonies vary greatly. Apart from figures of an earlier date for Maryland and Pennsylvania discussed in the chapters devoted to those colonies, one of the first attempts at computing their number is found in a letter from the English Bishop Richard Challoner to Doctor John Stonor, his English agent at Rome, of uncertain date but definitely after 1763.[20] It gives data on number, location, status, and prospects of Catholics in the several colonies. According to Bishop Challoner, Catholics may be found "here and there" in New England and New York, but as they are without priests and have little prospect of obtaining any, and as they live among "Presbyterians" and other sects equally unfriendly to Catholics, their status and their future are not encouraging. Only in Maryland and Pennsylvania, says the bishop, are there resident priests. In the latter colony Catholics, between six and seven thousand in number and largely of German stock with a sprinkling of Scots and French, are ministered to by four Jesuits distinguished alike for zeal and the edification of their lives. As they are tolerated by law, though denied the franchise, these Catholics enjoy full freedom of religion, and they have a "public church" in Philadelphia. In Maryland there are said to be approximately sixteen thousand Catholics, but only about half of them approach the sacraments regularly. Largely of English stock with an admixture of Irish, they are served by twelve

---

[20] "An Account of the Condition of the Catholic Religion in the English Colonies of America," *Catholic Historical Review*, number 4, Vol. 6, pp. 517-24, January 1921.

Jesuit missionaries. While the penal laws are still unrepealed, they are practically a dead letter because of the liberal-mindedness and connivance of the judiciary and the government, an observation applicable to Pennsylvania but in need of qualification for Maryland. Moreover, in the parts of Virginia adjacent to Maryland and in New Jersey bordering on Pennsylvania, there are some Catholics wholly dependent on the irregular visits of the priests from the neighboring provinces. As to Carolina and Georgia, it is "impossible to say whether there are any Catholics there or not. One thing is certain, there are no priests in those provinces."

Challoner's testimony with respect to the territory south of the Potomac was substantiated by the reminiscence of Bishop Benedict Fenwick of Boston in 1844. In a letter to a Bernard U. Campbell of Elicott's Mills in Baltimore County, Maryland, he says that before the American Revolution, to the best of his knowledge, there was not a single priest in Virginia, the Carolinas, or Georgia.[21] And he adds that the French military chaplains did not "meddle with ecclesiastical affairs" on shore. At all times they confined their ministration to the French forces. This may have been official policy, or more likely it was due to their ignorance of the English language.

Obviously, then, except in Maryland and Pennsylvania, Catholics were an insignificant group, if indeed they constituted a group. Converts were few, while defections were common because of inability to obtain instruction in the faith and to attend services or frequent the sacraments. In addition, life in a non-Catholic environment and atmosphere, and exclusion from civic life, even in Maryland and Pennsylvania, would tend to weaken the adherence of some to the creed of their fathers. Indeed, Catholics were few and for the most part scattered and wholly unorganized.[22] Sanford Cobb, however, was definitely very wrong in saying that there were not more than thirteen hundred "Romanists" between Canada and Florida.[23] Long before this, Pennsylvania alone counted several times this number.

---

[21] *Archives of the Archdiocese of Baltimore.* Benedict Fenwick to Bernard U. Campbell, January 4, 1844.

In further confirmation of Bishop Challoner's observation on the fewness of Catholics in New England, John Adams, in extolling the literacy of New England, asserted that "a native who cannot read or write is as rare an appearance as a Jacobite or a Roman Catholic, that is, as rare as a comet or earthquake"—a rather unique and fluctuating norm, be it said in passing. And if Braintree, his home town, was afflicted with "a few rascally Jacobites and Roman Catholics," they "dare not show themselves."[24] Could Ignatius Orcutt of Captain Obediah Beal's Company have been one of these frightened individuals who were given to discreet reticence?[25]

If Cobb erred through understatement, Barbé-Marbois sinned through gross exaggeration. Only four years after Yorktown he apportioned the Catholic population as follows: New England around 600, New York and New Jersey 1,700, Pennsylvania and Delaware 7,700, Maryland 20,000, of whom 12,000 were free and 8,000 were slaves, and south of the Potomac 2,500—a total of 32,500 in English-speaking United States. In addition there were 12,000 in the former French territory on the Mississippi and in southern Illinois and in Vincennes. Thus the grand total of 44,500 is reached. In this unduly optimistic report to Vergennes, Barbé-Marbois was accurate in at least one detail—"the

---

[22] "The area under the Vicar Apostolic in London included the English colonies in North America where twenty-three Jesuits were taking care of 23,000 Catholics of English, Irish and German descent" (Ludwig Pastor, *The History of the Popes*, translated by E. F. Peeler, Chap. 38, pp. 485-86. [St. Louis, 1923-] citing Borgia to Zelada, August 22, 1773. Archives of Propaganda. Miscell. V).

[23] Sanford Cobb, *The Rise of Religious Liberty in America*, p. 451. New York, 1902.

[24] Adams, *Works*, Vol. 9, p. 355.

[25] E. Victor Bigelow, *Narrative History of Cohasset*, p. 293. Boston, 1898.

Catholics of New York have no priest."[26] With mountain ranges, vast stretches of unexplored territory, and numerous tribes of hostile Indians intervening between the French and the English communities, communication was most irregular; and since no ties of common nationality, tradition, or language united them, cooperation was difficult if not quite impossible.

For knowledge of the number of Catholics in the United States, John Carroll had no peer. A native American and a member of a distinguished family, he was well educated, had traveled much, and had been active in the ministry for many years, and was shortly to be chosen first Catholic bishop of the new nation. His acquaintance with conditions was direct and personal; he did not rely on casual observation as did Barbé-Marbois or the opinion of others as did Bishop Challoner. He paints a somber picture of the situation in 1790. The fewness of the clergy constrained them to limit their ministrations to the barest essentials, with the faith of the laity suffering in consequence; and the poverty of their flocks, on whom the clergy depended for support, raised additional obstacles. Not only were expansion and growth retarded, but the faith itself was brought into disrepute by the scandalous lives of not a few, chiefly imported servants who, upon arrival in America, seemed inclined to throw off all moral restraint.[27] If such conditions obtained in Maryland and Pennsylvania, where there were resident clergy, what must they have been where Catholics could only be found "here and there," and members of the laity were on their own?

The small number of Catholics in New England is affirmed indirectly by travelers, as a rule by absence of mention of them. About 1759 Burnaby declared that "the established religion" is that of the Congregationalists, a religion differing "in some trifling articles, though not very material, from the Presbyterian," but there are also people of different persuasions, particularly "the religion of the Church of England."[28] When the Quebec Act was promulgated Patrick M'Roberts assigned to Massachusetts approximately "four hundred religious assemblies," mostly Independents, some Baptists and Quakers, and only twelve English churches.[29, 30]

---

[26] Bancroft, *Constitution*, Vol. 1, p. 421.

[27] Guilday, *John Carroll*, p. 59.

In 1779 Barbé-Marbois found that the only "authorized" churches in Boston were those enumerated by M'Roberts. Neither of them mention a Catholic church or Catholics. The erratic Frenchman seems to have attended services in some of the meetinghouses, for he comments that he heard "no discussions of doctrines." Instead, the discourses were on some point of morals "equally interesting to a Catholic, a protestant, a Jew, a Turk or an unbeliever."[31] Had New England preaching once so forthright been watered down to the exclusion of discussion of doctrinal issues? Abundant evidence testifies that this was not true. The experience of Barbé-Marbois or the sermons he heard must have been exceptional.

On the surface the war brought changes when Frenchmen foregathered in Boston and Newport. To his amazement Abbé Claude Robin discovered in 1781 that, although he was known to be a Frenchman and a "Roman Priest," several of the "best families" were tireless in extending "new civilities" to him, but that the people in general retained their old prejudices.[32] Even if Boston's elite could succumb to political demands and be courteous to an ally in spite of his priestly character, political affiliation could not induce the multitude to divest themselves of traditional attitudes and prejudices. They were still adamant, and unswerving in their loyalty to Puritan ideals; their perspective had undergone no change.

---

[28] Burnaby, *Travels*, p. 138.

[29] *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, Vol. 59, Letter III, p. 152, 1935.

[30] "Etended Pray on the Common in the morning. After that retired for Secret Prayer. And about ten went to the Chapel and herd the revent Doctor Langdon from Hebrew 2 10 for it Became him, And he encorridge us to Enlist our Selves under the Great Jeneral of our Salvation: And in the afternoon Went to the Meeting hous and herd Mr. Havery from Second Chronicles C 15. 14, 15 Varses. And they Sware Unto the Lord with a loud Voice" ("Diary of Amos Farnsworth," *Massachusetts Historical Society Proceedings*, second series, Vol. 12, p. 80, 1897-1899).

[31] Barbé-Marbois, *Letters*, p. 82.

[32] Robin, *New Travels*, p. 20.

But Ezra Stiles bore witness to Boston's partial deterioration. He mentions ruefully that the French sailors and "a few transient Settlers have obtained a Romish priest & I suppose bought the House and turned it into a Romish Chapel." What a break with New England's orthodox past, for this was the first Catholic church in New England, 168 years after the founding of Plymouth![33] What decadence this must have seemed to the doughty divine, bulwark and protagonist of unalloyed Protestantism! Besides, it questioned his bold prophecy heralding the establishment of Presbyterianism beyond the confines of New England. Many and varied were the casualties and changes brought on by the Revolution, and New England's religious insularity was included among them.

In Newport in 1759 Burnaby found Presbyterian, Quaker, Anabaptist, and Moravian meetinghouses and a synagogue; but as there was no established religion, "all other sects whatsoever" were free to "exercize their several professions."[34] M'Roberts confirmed Burnaby's findings; but Carl Bridenbaugh, who edited M'Roberts' *Tour*, appends a note to the effect that there was also a Sabbatarian congregation and two Baptist churches. Even though other denominations were at liberty to worship God in their own way, Newport was in a dither on August 29, 1780, when a score of savages, partly Iroquois and partly from the Fall of St. Louis near Albany, upon arrival, asked to hear Mass. That eventuality must await the passing of another decade. For on

---

[33] Stiles, *Literary Diary*, Vol. 3, p. 333.

[34] Burnaby, *Travels*, p. 127.

December 8, 1789, as the diary of Ezra Stiles reveals, the "Roman Worship" was performed for the first time in Rhode Island, when Reverend Abbé de la Poterie, a French Roman Catholic secular priest and a doctor of divinity, celebrated "the Holy sacrifice of the Mass at Providence."[35] Stiles adds quite correctly that the day was the feast of "immaculate Concept. of the Virgin Mary." Thus the defenses against popery were assaulted and surmounted, and Providence joined Boston as the scene of Catholic services.

The people of Connecticut, and particularly of New Haven, would scarcely have been pleased if they had been aware of M'Roberts' comment in 1774, that, while they had "a pleasant town" graced with four churches and were mostly Independents and keen antigovernment men, they were looked upon as "sharpers in trade."[36] Hartford, he said, with its seven Presbyterian churches and no Catholic church, was still a stronghold of Puritan orthodoxy.[37]

The religious map of New England did not differ drastically from the territory to the south, Maryland and Pennsylvania always excepted. Burnaby discovered a variety of denominations in New York: Church of England Congregations, dissenters of all denominations, Presbyterians preponderant, but also "some Roman Catholics."[38] Crèvecoeur in 1772 came upon a city of 28,000 people which boasted of no less than twenty churches, Episcopal, Jewish, French Calvinist, German Calvinist, Reformed Calvinist, Methodist, Presbyterian, Old Dutch, New Dutch, Anabaptist, Seceder, Quaker, Moravian, and Lutheran, but he mentions no place of Catholic worship.[39] In 1776 Nicholas Cresswell corroborated the enumeration of Crèvecoeur. Burnaby alone adverts to the presence of a few Catholics in 1759. More precise information as to their number comes only in 1785, when Father Ferdinand Farmer wrote to John Carroll that, on the authority of Father Charles Whelan, they were about 200.[40] But this may have been an overestimate, for after a visit to New York, Farmer informed Carroll that the Catholic congregation in that city appeared to be far from prosperous, and beset by vicissitudes. Their nature is revealed when Farmer comments that, since Father Whelan took charge, he had "only twenty odd communicants," and "I had eighteen, three of whom were Germans."[41] If only 38 among a reputed 200 communicants approached the sacraments, religious life was at very low ebb. Decades without a priest, or services, or instructions begot lukewarmness and indifference, and life in an atmosphere inimical to Catholicism had taken its toll; or most probably Whelan's estimate was somewhat inaccurate.

---

[35] Stiles, *Literary Diary*, Vol. 3, p. 375.

[36] M'Roberts, *Tour*, p. 149.

[37] "A Journal of the March of a Party of Provincials from Carlisle to Boston," *Archives of the Pennsylvania Historical Society*, second series, Vol. 15, p. 28.

[38] *Ibid.*, p. 116.

[39] *Magazine of American History*, Vol. 2, number 12, p. 751, December 1778. Two years later Patrick M'Roberts listed three English churches, three Presby-

Delaware conformed to the pattern of New England and New York insofar as Catholics were concerned. On a journey to survey the religious situation Francis Asbury testified to the presence of Baptists, Methodists, "old Churchmen," and some "Independent Presbyterians," but in reality "very little religion." He was of the opinion that a surfeit of preaching by Baptists and Methodists had hardened people—they had been "hurt by Calvinism."[42] Nowhere does he mention that he met a single Catholic. In turn the Swedish Lutheran Nicholas Collin lists the con-

---

terian, two Dutch Calvinists (!) . . . besides a French church, an Anabaptist, a Methodist, a Quaker meeting, a Moravian church, and a synagogue (M'Roberts, "Tour through Part of the Northern Provinces of America," p. 140).

[40] J. R. Bailey, *A Brief Sketch of the History of the Catholic Church on the Island of New York*, p. 42. New York, 1853.

[41] *Ibid.*, pp. 41-42.

[42] Francis Asbury, *An Extract from the Journal of Francis Asbury*, p. 126. Philadelphia, 1802.

gregations in Raccoon and Pensneck, but Catholics got no recognition.[43] While he journeyed through North Carolina, Francis Asbury once more stressed the "hardness" of the people, despite the preaching of Presbyterians, Baptists, and Methodists. Only among some of the last did he discover "life," and he predicted its growth; the others he judged to be spiritually moribund. Nevertheless, he confessed that hitherto he may have entertained "too mean an opinion of Carolina," for it was in reality a better country, and the people were better than he had supposed on the basis of the information at his command.[44] Religious conditions may have improved in the interval; but only five years before Asbury's sojourn Reverend William Tennant who, together with Mr. Drayton, was sent to the upper country of Carolina to convert the Tories to the patriot cause, remarked that the people of South Carolina had no opportunity to worship God because the territory was "destitute of the least form of religion."[45] Neither Asbury nor Tennant encountered Catholics; nor do they allude to their presence.

In summation, then, on the basis of the available sources it appears that in the era of the American Revolution the population of the colonies fighting for independence was in the neighborhood of 2,500,000, while the most reliable authorities fix the total Catholic population at 25,000, more or less. Thus the ratio of Catholics to the total population was a mere one per cent. More specifically in New York and New Jersey it was only one half of one per cent, while in New England it was slightly in excess of one tenth of one per cent, roughly one in a thousand people; and in Virginia and the other states south of the Old Dominion it approached zero. Here John Adams' dictum was literally true—

---

[43] Johnson, *Nicholas Collin*, p. 224.

[44] Asbury, *Journal*, p. 113.

[45] R. W. Gibbes, *Documentary History of the American Revolution, 1764-1776*, p. 237. New York, 1855.

Catholics were as rare as an earthquake.[46] Even in Maryland and Pennsylvania denial of the suffrage and exclusion from political life made outcasts of Catholics. They were looked down upon and distrusted; at best they were only tolerated.

Finally, it must not be overlooked that the 25,000 Catholics included the infirm, open and secret Tories, the devout, and those who were Catholics only in name. The reservoir of able-bodied Catholic recruits qualified to bear arms in the patriot army was pitifully small, and this small body was dispersed over a wide area. Even if they had emulated the Germans of Philadelphia who, in an outburst of loyalty, are said to have formed a regiment, the commander of which was a patriarch over one hundred years old, Catholics could not have contrived to enroll a large force. In numbers their contribution must be on a modest scale. Only blind prejudice, crass ignorance, or an overwrought imagination could magnify Catholics into the serious menace to the security, religious freedom, and peace of their Protestant fellow citizens, as was alleged so persistently. The truth is that in New England, New York, New Jersey, Virginia, and the Carolinas, Catholics were so few and so lacking in cohesion and organization that their support, indifference, or opposition mattered little if at all. But in the key states of Maryland and Pennsylvania, Catholics were more numerous—numerous enough in fact, that, even if their organization was only rudimentary, their opposition would constitute a definite threat to the hopes and the efforts of the patriots.

---

[46] J. Franklin Jameson assigns only 50 of the 3,105 religious organizations in America to Catholics (J. Franklin Jameson, *The American Revolution Considered as a Social Movement*, p. 133. Princeton, 1940).

CHAPTER VIII

Catholics or Only Celts?

With the ratio of Catholics to the total population established, insofar as that can be possible with limited records, we undertake the still more difficult task of ascertaining the religious affiliation of those who fought the American Revolution. It is not easy to determine how many Catholics served under the Continental Congress, for some of the ordinary aids to solution fail us. For example, regimental lists of Continental regulars and of militia do not indicate the religion of the men. In a general way, perhaps, because of the way regiments were recruited and organized, it may be inferred that the religion of the chaplain was that of the majority of the men; but while the inference is valid for the body as a whole, it cannot be applied with assurance to any individual in the group. Even less satisfactory is recourse to the norm sometimes designated "Catholic names." This is a hazardous process and inconclusive, and its application has led to gross error. There are authors, usually the victims of undue enthusiasm for a nationality or a creed, who have concluded that a certain name proves that the individual "must have been one of ours." In reality this is no proof; and given the circumstances which concern us, it is not even adequate for a valid assumption. The fallacy of this procedure is illustrated even in Doctor Peter Guilday, a scholar rightfully accorded a place among the foremost historians of his time. Guilday inveighed against this faulty technique of deducing a man's creed merely from his name. To exemplify his own caution and conservatism he listed a few persons whom he accepted as unquestionably Catholics, among them Timothy Murphy, the redoubtable sharpshooter of Morgan's Rifles, who inflicted a mortal wound on General Frazer in the battle of Saratoga and thereby played a definite part in turning the battle into a resounding American victory. Guilday acclaims him the "most romantic figure of adventure during the whole war."[1] The irony of it is that Murphy was not a Catholic, as Michael J. O'Brien has demonstrated in his biography. If such a combination as Timothy and Murphy belies the validity of the "Catholic name theory," the futility of its application to the armies of the Revolution is apparent. In no case may we waive positive proof. How did this somewhat paradoxical situation come about? The answer lies in the extraordinary influx from Ireland on the eve of the revolt and earlier. Thus an investigation of this transplantation becomes imperative in any study of the Catholicity of America's defenders.

Many contemporary travelers and diarists note the presence of Irishmen in the American army; not a few express amazement at their number. What proportion of them were Catholics? Who can say? There are those who hold that no definite answer is possible. The root of the difficulty is our uncertainty as to the creed of earlier Irish immigrants to America rather than ignorance of the religion of the tidal wave of arrivals just before the Revolution. As we insisted, the common criteria fail us, for when we find a Thomas O'Beirne serving as a chaplain on Howe's flagship we despair of establishing the creed of a man through his name.[2]

---

[1] Guilday, *John Carroll*, p. 86.

[2] Serle, *American Journal*, pp. 22-23.

In general the Irish, whether Catholics or Presbyterians, were in full accord with the cause of the country of their adoption,[3] though there were also Tories among them, as we shall show elsewhere. One investigator, after prolonged study of this subject, concluded that the Irish in the American Revolution, "whom our orators laud were Presbyterians." He believed that Catholics among them were not numerous, but that they contributed a few "foremost worthies" unknown to the Catholics of his day—a situation now happily rectified.[4]

That the enemies of America should have indulged in disparagement of Washington and his army and have singled out the Irish element as their special target may be regarded as a by-product of war, but it comes as a shock to meet equally offensive language by Americans, even men in high position. Doctor Jeremy Belknap gives an instance. At a dinner attended by Thomas Lynch, delegate to Congress from South Carolina, Benjamin Franklin, Generals Gates, Lee, and Mifflin, and Colonels Harrison and Reed, Gates paid high tribute to the New England soldiery, but "all joined in execrating the Irish." Belknap explains this stricture by adding that, while many of the riflemen in the American army were of that nation, they were continually deserting to the enemy. This is a generalization which contains more than a grain of exaggeration, for it ignores several factors.[5]

The partiality of Ambrose Serle, private secretary of Admiral Lord Richard Howe, might be expected. Though he lacked personal and direct contact with the men who served under the rebel flag and knew nothing of their background, he categorized the "vast numbers" of Irishmen as "convicted felons," happy to live "an idle vagabond life," and well disposed to "any bad purpose." He recommended that hereafter, instead of transportation to America, hard labor in England would be a more suitable penalty for their offenses, and this practice would not add to the military strength of America. Such language refutes itself.[6]

---

[3] Thomas Addis Emmet, "Irish Emigration during the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," *Journal of American Irish Historical Society*, Vol. 2, p. 15, 1899.

[4] Griffin, "Irish Catholics and the Revolution," pp. 341, 342.

[5] Jeremy Belknap, "Journal of Rev. Dr. Jeremy Belknap," *Massachusetts Historical Society Proceedings*, first series, Vol. 4, p. 83, 1858-1860.

Equally beneath serious consideration as an index of fact are observations of Doctor John Berkenhout on a trip from New York to Philadelphia in September 1778. To Berkenhout the American army consisted predominantly of "Irish transports" and officers from that country. Far from being a "respectable body of yeomanry," fighting for their rights, liberties, and homes as the patriots held, Washington's troops were a "contemptible body of vagrants, deserters and thieves."[7] No weight is to be attached to this snap judgment. We cite Serle and Berkenhout only as evidence that in the American army Irishmen abounded.

But this intemperate language had its counterpart among the defenders of America. Without indicating when, where, or by whom the speech was delivered, a Captain Robert Kirkwood offers an excerpt. Addressing his countrymen and fellows under arms, the speaker urges them to attack the "disunited Rabble" that confronts them. As a spur to action he assures them that notable additions to the American army will result. For the Irish in British uniform, overcome by shame and remorse at having deserted their country's cause, will change sides; and the Scots, recalling their quondam freedom and reflecting how they have been despoiled of it, will likewise join the "assertors of Freedom." Even the Hessians will be inspired to imitate such example. With such prospects what could there be to fear?[8] Here was wishful thinking and fustian of the highest order.

---

[6] Serle, *American Journal*, p. 106.

[7] John Berkenhout, "Journal of an Excursion from New York to Philadelphia in the Year 1778," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, Vol. 65, p. 91, January 1941.

It may astonish many to be told that as early as 1682 some Irish Quakers disembarked in America. Other migrations followed before 1750, but the number was small, somewhere in the neighborhood of 150 adults all told. They hailed from Ulster, Leinster, and Munster. The counties of Antrim, Armagh, Meath, Carlow, Dublin, Wicklow, Cork, Limerick, Tipperary, and Waterford were all represented. They found new homes in Philadelphia, Chester, and York, and in Bucks, Berks, and three nearby counties. When the American Revolution broke out approximately 400 of their descendents actively espoused the patriot cause by enlisting, by accepting positions under the new government, or by affirmation of allegiance, while perhaps a score sided with the British. For their pains both groups were disowned by their brethren and ejected from the Friends, with consequent loss of their birthright.[9]

Irish emigration to America assumed greater proportion about 1718, and it continued as a fairly steady stream till 1770, when it became a torrent. Griffin is of the opinion that this migration was "wholly Presbyterian," with Catholics so few as to be negligible.[10] Ramsay also holds that by 1750 America had received a large accession of people from the northern counties of Ireland.[11] Flood tide came in the early 1770's. The *Belfast News* is cited by Ambrose Serle as warrant that in 1771 and 1772 nearly 18,000 set sail for America from North Ireland. Refusal to pay additional tithes and rents led to evictions from the estate of the Marquis of Donegal in Antrim, and the Test

---

[8] Robert Kirkwood, "The Journal and Orderly Book of Captain Robert Kirkwood," *Delaware Historical Society Publication*, pp. 112-13, 1910.

[9] Albert C. Myers, *Immigration of Irish Quakers into Pennsylvania, 1682-1750*, pp. 232-33, Swarthmore, 1902.

[10] Griffin, "Irish Catholics and the Revolution," p. 341.

[11] David Ramsay, *History of South Carolina*, Vol. 1, p. 109. 2 vols. Charleston, 1809.

Act, the Woolen Act, and the decline of linen manufacturing impelled others to emigrate. They were substantial citizens, chiefly farmers and linen workers able to pay their passage to America.[12] This is corroborated by Marmion, who adds that by converting their property into specie which they carried with them they drained Ulster of one fourth of its circulating medium and brought on financial stringency.[13] In 1773 the number of emigrants rose to 25,000. Finally, on the authority of the "Hon. & Right Revd. Bp." in the north of Ireland, as Serle informs us, from 1770 to 1774 more than 33,000 persons quitted Ireland for America. Serle deemed them mostly Presbyterians in religion and "disposed absolutely to the present Faction in Government," so that by 1776 they were among the principal "agitators in these confusions."[14] This impact of 33,000 additional people within four years is studied in more detail in our appraisal of the Irish in Pennsylvania. Not only were they people of some means and hostile to Britain, but one account contends that their intelligence and respectability may be gauged from the fact that, though in the land of their birth "sectarian intolerance and bigotry had always burned fiercely," in the land of their adoption they were noted for tolerance.[15]

To facilitate our task we turn to the several colonies and survey our problem at close range and in local setting. Late in 1717 and throughout 1718 immigrants from Ireland came to Massachusetts.[16] Their wretchedness aroused the sympathy and concern of Cotton Mather to such a degree that he mentioned them repeatedly in his diary.[17] He expressed his readiness to lend a hand to alleviate their distress; he pondered what should be done; he surmised that great good might accrue to America from this influx of people. Apparently these newcomers were quickly assimilated; at any rate their influence was slight and their numbers could not have been large, for in 1765, outside of Boston, the Irish are said to have constituted only .02 per cent.[18] In 1766 a new wave of immigration hit Massachusetts' shores, but it soon spent itself. On a reduced scale it continued somewhat spasmodically for several years, but of the three hundred who came to Boston in seven and a half months in 1769 only seven had Irish names.[19] Boston's population of 15,520 in 1770 counted only 1,368 Irish, a meager .088 per cent,[20] and in the entire province there were but 2,198 Irish in a population of 120,070, a percentage of .018.[21] By 1774 contact between Ireland and Massachusetts had all but ceased, as the *Boston Evening Post* and other newspapers bear witness. Occasionally, however, an Irishman found his way to Massachusetts; for example Dennis Hogan, Joseph Finlay, Michael Doherty, and John Huzzey.[22] What religion they professed we have no means of learning for certain. That some of the Irish immigrants prospered is established by Abbé Claude Robin, who in 1781 came upon a number engaged in the manufacture of linen and attempting broadcloth.[23] Robin classified them as Presbyterians; and George Francis Donovan, who made researches on the subject of the Irish in Massachusetts from 1620 to 1775, admits that as a rule Presbyterianism is set down as their religion. Nevertheless, without revealing the grounds on which he bases his certainty, he contends that there were certainly Catholics to be found among them.[24, 25]

---

[12] Serle, *American Journal*, p. 76.

[13] Emmet, "Irish Emigration during the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," p. 12.

[14] Serle, *American Journal*, p. 76; "It is computed that during 1771-1773 twenty-five or thirty thousand emigrants sailed from Ulster alone to ports in the new world, especially to those on the Delaware" (Dunaway, *Scotch-Irish*, p. 39).

[15] *Society of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick*, p. 14.

[16] George Francis Donovan, *The Pre-Revolution Irish in Massachusetts, 1620-1775*, p. 21. Menasha, 1931.

---

[17] *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, seventh series, Vol. 8, pp. 475, 482, 549, 555.

[18] Donovan, *Pre-Revolution Irish*, p. 139.

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 40.

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 52.

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 139.

[22] Ethel S. Bolton, *Immigrants to New England, 1700-1775*, passim. Essex Institute Historical Collections. Salem, 1931.

[23] Robin, *New Travels*, p. 18.

For reasons beyond the scope of our inquiry the decline of shipping between Boston and Ireland in the 1770's was countered by a tremendous spurt in trade between New York and Ireland. The *New York Gazette and Weekly Mercury* for January 3, 1774, listed ten ships clearing for Dublin, Cork, Londonderry, Newry, and Belfast, and fourteen weighed anchor for Irish ports on December 19. Patrick M'Roberts ascribed the glutting of the labor market of New York to the influx of "adventurers" from Britain and Ireland.[26] If we may judge by an advertisement in the *New York Gazette and Weekly Mercury* for May 2, these immigrants included many artisans—weavers, tailors, blacksmiths, shoemakers, butchers, wheelwrights, hatters, and "spinsters," and their ages ranged from fourteen to thirty-five. Again we are ignorant of their religion. Most probably they were Presbyterians; and if they hailed from Belfast, Londonderry, or Newry, probability verges on certainty.

New Jersey's lack of a major port cut her off from this phenomenal influx of Irishmen, but Delaware, with doors to the sea at Wilmington and New Castle, yielded precedence only to Philadelphia as haven for the host that swept out of Ulster between 1771 and 1774. Despite her handicap New Jersey had whole communities that were Presbyterian. Lieutenant James McMichael found in the exclusive Presbyterianism of Morristown

---

[24] Donovan, *Pre-Revolution Irish*, p. 138.

[25] Illustrative of the futility of arguing from a name is the following: 1772. Sept. 9. A fast at Grafton on account of difficulties between pastor and church; Rev. Mr. Maccarty of Worcester preached. "Extracts from Mr. [Joseph] Willard's Diary," *Collections of the Worcester Society of Antiquities*, Vol. 14, p. 162, 1895.

[26] *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, Vol. 59, p. 146, 1935.

compensation for the village's unattractiveness.[27] Delaware too furnishes instances which underscore the folly of relying on the "Catholic name theory."[28] When Francis Asbury journeyed through that state he encountered a Mr. O'Neal, whom he characterizes a man of learning and understanding, well versed in theology and knowledge of human nature, a minister of the Episcopal Church in Maryland and a nonjuror.[29]

Pennsylvania loomed as the land of promise to the majority of those who contemplated leaving Ireland for America. Dunaway insists that the evidence points to the conclusion that from 1770 to 1775 at least 50,000 left Ireland for America, the majority of whom settled in Pennsylvania, and that the bulk of them were Ulster Scots, overwhelmingly Protestant and mainly Presbyterians. About 1719 the vanguard arrived, chiefly north-of-Ireland people, who located near the Maryland-Pennsylvania boundary, then still under dispute.[30] Reverend Joseph Doddridge compliments them by observing that, because they were Presbyterians, they were more reserved in conduct than their neighbors on the frontier.[31] By 1729 Irishmen outnumbered other immigrants to Pennsylvania by ten to one. That year witnessed the arrival of 267 English and Welsh, 243 Palatine Germans, 43 Scots, and 5,655 who were classified as Irishmen.[32] Spreading over the frontier and beyond, perhaps the victims of nostalgia, they dotted Pennsylvania with a place nomenclature reminiscent of the country they had left. A Dublin, Belfast, Donegal, Tyrone, and Derry came into being in Penn's woods; Irish place names in Pennsylvania became almost as numerous as on the map of Ireland. Whole rural districts were solidly Presbyterian.[33] One contingent occupied a corner of Lancaster County. The Cumberland Valley was taken over completely, and from this base they pushed westward into the virgin territory of Bedford and Westmoreland counties.[34] Groups of two or three families wandered even to the Susquehanna, far from fixed settlements in search of a promising location. Presbyterians, and strongly individualistic, they soon evinced a flair for politics and leadership, and their hatred of England was no secret. The clergy wielded great influence over their flocks, and they were adept in associating politics with religion.[35]

---

[27] "Diary of Lt. James McMichael, 1776-1778," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, Vol. 16, number 2, p. 141, July 1892.

[28] Nicholas Collin furnishes a striking disproof of this so-called theory: "On June 23 [1783] I baptized Maria Carney, 29 years old, together with her three children, 11, 5 and 1 years old. Her husband, Thomas Carney, an Irishman, had been brought up in the English church and during the last years he quite often attended Divine Services in Pensneck" (Johnson, *Nicholas Collin*, p. 272).

[29] Asbury, *Journal*, pp. 35-36.

[30] Rupp. *Berks and Lebanon*, Vol. 1, p. 114.

[31] Joseph Dodderidge, *Notes on the Settlement and Indian Wars of the Western Parts of Virginia and Pennsylvania*, p. 183. Wellburgh, 1824.

[32] *Society of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick*, quoting Gordon, *Pennsylvania*, pp. 207-08.

On the flood tide of Irish immigration to Pennsylvania, on the eve of the Revolution, came individuals with such Gaelic names as Kane, Kelley, Reilly, Connell, McEvoy, Maginnis, Burk, Driscoll, Scanlan, Regan, O'Connor, Taafe, Farrell, Connolly, Maloney, Finlay, Barry, Murphy; and so far as we know, they were all Presbyterians. The background, occasion, and course of this exodus are furnished by Anthony Marmion. When the leases on one of the estates of the Marquis of Donegal in Antrim expired in 1771, renewal was made contingent on the payment of substantial additional fees to the landlord and his agents. Refusal or inability to pay these arbitrary impositions led to evictions of former tenants and the introduction of newcomers. Violence flared; outrages were perpetrated on the lands and cattle of the new occupants; an association of "Hearts of Steel" came into being. Spreading to adjoining counties but centering in Ulster, this agrarian insurrection induced thousands of these embittered people to emigrate to America. In 1771, 1772, and 1773 thirty ships left Belfast, thirty-six cleared from Londonderry, and twenty-two from Newry. Perhaps as many as twenty-five thousand persons bade reluctant farewell to Ireland. Before departure these sturdy farmers and linen manufacturers converted their property into specie which they carried away with them. Thus Ulster lost much of its circulating medium—Marmion says one fourth—and a considerable portion of its man power. Not only did Ulster suffer great economic loss, but the incident won for England a host of new enemies, for in America these exiles, ever hopeful of redressing their wrongs, were quick to join Washington's army. As Marmion puts it, "Many of these who had so recently invoked 'the glorious and immortal memory of William III,' 'The Boyne Water,' and 'Protestant Ascendancy all over the World,' were now loud in praise of Franklin, Paine and Washington."[36] Their bitterness begot an élan and steadfastness the British were to rue, for they played an important role in effecting independence.

---

[33] D. H. Sloan, *A History of the Presbytery of Kittaning*, p. 19. Pittsburgh, 1888.

[34] Brunhouse, *Counter Revolution*, p. 3.

[35] D. C. Millett, *The History of the Parish of St. Thomas Church, Whitemarsh, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania*, p. 6. Doylestown, 1864. "It is to be noted, however, . . . that from the earliest records, to the war, and immediately upon a resumption of the service after the peace, some member of the Burk family is always found among the wardens and vestrymen . . . The present senior warden, Mr. Charles Burk . . . has held his present office for 29 years."

Philadelphia drew the bulk of these arrivals, but Wilmington and New Castle were the gateway to America for many. A list of the ships that docked at Philadelphia is impressive; of more importance is the human cargo aboard each vessel.[37] More Irish

---

[36] Anthony Marmion, *The Ancient and Modern History of the Maritime Ports of Ireland*, pp. 333-34. London, 1855.

[37] List of Immigrant Vessels—1772-1773.

	Ship	Captain	From	
May 12	Brig Connolly	Cain	Dublin	94
May 18	Snow Brittania	Eyres	Dublin	26
May 24	Brig Matty	Cochran	Glasgow	39
June 11	Ship Minerva	Faries	Newry	80

names were added to Pennsylvania's population, for as a rule these people sought new homes in Pennsylvania, although a few drifted to Virginia. New territory was opened to settlement and Presbyterianism. The courtesy and hospitality of the new colonists and their thorough religious indoctrination were noted.[38,39] Dunaway contends that, while Sandy might be a bit bigoted, he had the Scotch granite in his make-up; emphatically he was no reed shaken by the wind. The mass migration brought caravans to the frontier almost daily, where, as if by magic, new settlements sprang up. In November 1772 David McClure engaged to preach in five new communities near Ligonier, not one of

---

	Ship	Captain	From	
June 14	Brig Charlotte	Montgomery	Newry	63
June 17	Brig Peggy	McKinsey	Belfast	118
July 2	Ship Jenny	McIlvaine	Londonderry	80
July 4	Snow Charlotte	Cap. Curtis	Waterford	81
July 6	Brig Agnes	Cap. Living	Belfast	36
July 8	Ship Bettsey	Cap. McCutcheon	Newry	228
July 13	Snow Penn	Cap. McCaddon	Cork	81
August 2	Ship Newry Assistance	Cuningham	Newry	87
August 2	Ship Jupiter	Capt. Swing	Londonderry	128
August 6	Ship Alexr	Hunter	Londonderry	179
August 8	Hannah	Mitchell	Londonderry	182
Sept. 2	Snow Sarah	Curry	Dublin	115
Sept. 8	Brig Loniser	Kirkpatrick	Londonderry	46
Sept. 17	Ship Rose	Robert George	Derry	150
Sept. 21	Snow Peggy	William Hastie	Glasgow	43
Sept. 21	Ship Brittania	James Peter	Rotterdam	307
Sept. 28	Ship Union	Bryson	Cowes	287
Oct. 4	Hope	Johnson	Cowes	200

Record of Servants and Apprentices Bound and Assigned before Hon. John Gibson, Mayor of Philadelphia, December 5, 1772-May 21, 1773 (*Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, Vol. 33, pp. 475-76, October 1909).

[38] McClure, *Diary*, pp. 38, 41.

[39] William Ellery, "Diary of Hon. William Ellery of Rhode Island, June 28—July 23, 1778," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, Vol. 11, number 4, p. 476, January 1888. "Lodged at McLaughlin's . . . He is a staunch Irish true blue Presbyterian. There is a large parish of that Denomination of Christians in this Quarter, and a very decent Meetinghouse, and they are all warm Whigs."

which was six years old.[40] The next year, when he lodged with a Doctor Kennedy "near the White House," his host told him that "some thousands" of people from Ireland were coming to settle "in the back parts of the province."[41] The rush from Ireland to Pennsylvania not only continued, but grew in volume. In August 1773, within a fortnight, 3,500 souls arrived, 550 aboard the ship *Alexander*, Captain Hunter, and the same number on the *Hannah*, Captain Mitchell, both from Londonderry.[42] Today such an influx of immigrants would attract public notice; in 1773 it created a sensation, and in some quarters consternation. Philadelphia's facilities were overtaxed. The inundation became the topic of conversation and discussion. Word spread that nearby ports were equally overwhelmed.[43] With so many Presbyterians added to Pennsylvania's population, what would become of the Quaker ascendancy? Granted that the newcomers sought homes beyond Philadelphia, in the new location they were bound to prevail by sheer weight of numbers and displace Quaker leadership. Quakers took alarm, for on principle they were pacifists; the times were troubled, the Irish were thought to be bellicose, and they were known to be bent on avenging their wrongs. The future threatened, and the stream of immigrants showed no signs of abatement. Almost overnight the Presbyterians became the most numerous sect in the province and their pro-Whig sympathies were ominous.[44]

The American Revolution offered the exiles from Ireland the opportunity they awaited. With few exceptions, so we are assured, they made their own the cause of the country of their adoption, and on the morrow of Bunker Hill they flocked to enroll under her standard. The Pennsylvania Irish, particularly those with north-of-Ireland antecedents, turned out under the command of Colonel Edward Hand and William Irvine, both Irishmen.[45] Hand, so it is claimed, was of Catholic parentage from the north of Ireland, but now he no longer professed the faith of his childhood.[46] However, there may have been a sizable element of Catholics in Hand's contingent, for Daniel Barber styled them and the regiment from Maryland "Catholic troops," and he voiced his delight at the harmony and amicable relations between them and the Presbyterians of New England.[47]

---

[40] McClure, *Diary*, p. 104.

[41] *Ibid.*, p. 130.

[42] *Maryland Gazette and Baltimore Advertiser*, August 20, 1773.

[43] The Irish Quaker merchant Christopher Marshall in July and August recorded the arrival of ships in New Castle, all freighted with Irish immigrants—400 on the ship Peace and Plenty, 450 on the Minerva, 110 on the Snow Charlotte, 220 on the Hope, 350 on the Renown, 400 on the Hannah, 600 on the Alexander (Marshall, *Diary*, pp. 7, 8, 9).

[44] Gordon, *Pennsylvania*, p. 571.

If the Delaware River was the main stream of Irish immigration to America, the Chesapeake might be regarded as a rivulet. The inundation of Philadelphia interested Baltimore, but that port was denied experience parallel to that of her neighbor. Why this should be is not apparent, nor is it too relevant to our problem. It may well be that the Irish Presbyterians, despite the spirit of tolerance attributed to them, did not look with favor on settlement in a province where so many Catholics were known to dwell; they preferred another location. If Maryland held out inducements to the immigrant Irish at this juncture, there is little evidence that they succumbed in substantial numbers to the lure. There may have been more Catholic Irish in Maryland than in Pennsylvania, but we have no ground for the inference that the number was large or even appreciable. Not all of the Irish already in Maryland were Catholic in belief. A case in point was Reverend Patrick Allison, a native of Ireland, the first pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Baltimore, and later chaplain of Congress when that body convened in Baltimore during the British occupation of Philadelphia. Allison was one of the organizers of the Sons of Liberty. Irishmen constituted the backbone of Rawling's Maryland Riflemen and Brown's Maryland Artillery, but their religious affiliation is shrouded in impenetrable uncertainty.[48]

---

[45] "Irish Emigration during the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," Emmet, pp. 13, 173.

[46] Hand is buried in the Episcopal churchyard in Lancaster City; Irvine in the First Presbyterian churchyard. His troops, largely Presbyterian, joined the American army before Boston shortly after Washington took command (Emmet, "Irish Emigration during the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," pp. 13, 68).

[47] *The Pennsylvania Packet* for May 2, 1780, contains the singular contribution of 'Anti-Anglican' to the Inhabitants of Ireland. No. VIII. The writer boasts that many of the privates, and some of the best officers, in the Continental Army are of Irish stock, but very few Irish Americans have joined the enemy. He argues that the "politeness" accorded by the British to American prisoners carried to Irish ports proves that neither does Ireland "disdain" her children, nor do her offspring in America disgrace her. With charming naivete he acquaints his Philadelphia readers that the seven previous letters have appeared in the *Maryland Gazette* because he sojourned some weeks in that commonwealth.

While ships were plying in such numbers between Philadelphia and Ireland, a mere dozen are listed as entering or clearing Baltimore in 1774, and only three in 1775;[49] and since all but one had ties with Newry, Londonderry, or Belfast, the presumption must be that they brought Presbyterians to the New World. Aboard the *Baltimore Packet*, Alexander Kennedy, master, out of Newry, were a number of "healthy Men and Women Servants," the men tradesmen and farmers, the women spinners and domestics.[50] Would Hugh M'Leane from Antrim and Francis M'Gonegal from Londonderry have been other than Presbyterians? The probability that they were Catholics is remote.[51]

---

[48] Haltigan, *Irish*, p. 27.

[49] *Maryland Gazette*, passim.

[50] *Maryland Journal and Baltimore Advertiser*, July 2-9, 1774.

[51] "Morris M'Gounegal, shoemaker, takes this method to acquaint his brother, Francis M'Gonegal, who lately arrived from Londonderry, in the ship Hannah, Captain Mitchell, that he would be glad to see him at his residence near the Bald Fryar Ferry, Susquehannah" (*Maryland Journal and Baltimore Advertiser*, August 24, 1774).

The status of indentured servant may have weighed too heavily on many of these transplanted Irish. At all events, the colonial press abounds in notices of those who took french leave of their masters. For example, in the *Maryland Journal and Baltimore Advertiser* James Welsh acquainted the public that James Coughlan, his servant, had absconded. To aid identification he furnished a detailed description of Coughlan's height, hair, eyes, countenance, and apparel. He added that, though Coughlan spoke English well, his brogue and behavior would betray his Irish origin and rearing. He concluded his advertisement with the assertion that, while Coughlan pretended to be a strict Roman Catholic, he was in reality a hypocrite.[52] Knowledge of how numerous Coughlan's compatriots were in Maryland and how many of them were genuine Catholics is denied us, but it is safe to say that Reverend James Macgill of Elk Ridge Landing, who deplored the theft of his sorrell stallion, did not share the religion that Coughlan professed or feigned.[53] Uncertainty in regard to Irishmen in Maryland is heightened by such patent contradictions as that of Thomas Anburey, who first assures us that "Frederick-Town" counted two or three thousand inhabitants mainly Irish with an admixture of Germans, and later insists that the town had close to two thousand people chiefly Germans.[54]

Virginia, it would seem, received only a few Irish stragglers from Maryland and Pennsylvania. At what he euphemistically called a ball in Alexandria in 1775, Nicholas Cresswell found the men present mostly "Scotch and Irish," but he did not indicate how many there were.[55] Similarly in July, Claude Blanchard lodged in Dumfries in Virginia in the home of a "pretty handsome" young Irish woman. The wife of a Scotchman, she had come to America nine years previous when only seventeen years of age, and Blanchard surmised that she desired to leave. In the evening Blanchard introduced her to the Irish Abbé Lacy, the chaplain of the French hospital. Not a word about her religion; no mention of her seizing the opportunity to receive the sacraments. Under the circumstances one should think that Blanchard would have mentioned her Catholicity if this had been her creed. However, shame may have prompted Blanchard's reserve, for a horse was stolen from him, and the finger of suspicion pointed to the relatives of the amiable woman. In addition, inquiry revealed that her relatives and her husband enjoyed very unsavory reputations, and gossip even held her guilty of gallantries, a charge which Blanchard repudiated on the ground that such misconduct was rare in America, and besides, "she was born in Europe"[56] —a novel argument, but not one that begets conviction.

---

[52] *Maryland Journal and Baltimore Advertiser*, January 2, 1775.

[53] *Ibid.*, December 20, 1775.

[54] Anburey, *Travels*, Vol. 2, pp. 179, 312.

[55] Cresswell, *Journal*, p. 53.

That Irish Presbyterians abounded on the Virginia frontier almost to the exclusion of other denominations seems a sound inference from the journal of Philip Vickers Fithian, a Presbyterian clergyman who toured the area in 1775 and 1776. Everywhere he found Presbyterians. His impressions and experiences are not without interest and pertinence to our study. The ordeal of an hour of "full-mouthed blubbering Irish compliments" disturbed his equanimity;[57] he met a Mr. M'Ginnis, at one time a Baptist minister but now a constable;[58] he struck up an acquaintance with a Mr. Doheda, "a smart agreeable Irishman";[59] and a Mr. McCartney gave him one pound, five shillings, and ninepence, evidently the collection, for conducting service. One Sunday Fithian was frightened when he asked one of the audience "to set the tune," and the individual objected, saying that he did not know "whether I was a Papist, a Methodist, or a Baptist or a

---

[56] Blanchard, *Journal*, pp. 165-66.

[57] Philip Vickers Fithian, *Philip Vickers Fithian: Journal, 1775-1776*, edited by Robert G. Albion and Leonidas Dodson, p. 18. Princeton, 1934.

[58] *Ibid.*, p. 30.

[59] *Ibid.*, p. 40.

Seceder."[60] Fithian was assured that in the East Kishacoquillas Valley all of the people were Presbyterians except "eight sour unbrotherly Seceders and one sociable agreeable churchman."[61] In Opiekon, three miles southeast of Winchester, the Irish predominated. They flattered the preacher by close attention during the sermon.[62] At North Mountain there were only Irish Presbyterians, but Shirley was undergoing the anguish of religious discord because there was also a Baptist and a Methodist contingent in this predominantly Presbyterian community.[63] This implies that religious toleration was at a very low ebb.

In North Carolina there never was a sizable Irish population, even if seven hundred Irish settlers are said to have gone to the Carolinas in the autumn of 1773.[64] The few Irish there may have drifted into the province from South Carolina. Evidence is very scanty. Diligent search has brought to light only some extracts from the letters of Lieutenant Enos Reeves, who traveled through the state in 1782. His comments were unfavorable, even caustic. Near Guilford he lodged with a Colonel Peasley on the edge of a Presbyterian settlement.[65] Salisbury he deemed a drab village of perhaps forty dwellings, the people Irish and lacking in refinement, the women coarse, uncouth, and tawdrily dressed.[66] Charlotte's moral climate was nauseating, for each girl had a "spark," and the abominable practice of bundling was in vogue.[67] Either Reeves may have been somewhat of a misogynist or conditions were very bad, for he declared that the oldest of Mr.

---

[60] *Ibid.*, p. 39.

[61] *Ibid.*, p. 100.

[62] *Ibid.*, p. 17.

[63] *Ibid.*, p. 122.

[64] Emmet, "Irish Emigration in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," p. 139, see note 3.

[65] "Extracts from the Letter-Books of Lt. Enos Reeves, Letter 238," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, Vol. 21, No. 4, p. 467, January 1897.

[66] *Ibid.*, p. 469.

[67] *Ibid.*, p. 470.

Galbraith's daughters was the only "genteel girl" he had come across in three hundred miles.[68]

South Carolina, however, experienced an inundation that remotely rivaled Philadelphia's in size, if not in the quality and financial status of the immigrants. On the authority of David Ramsay, Ireland supplied South Carolina with most of its early inhabitants. The raising of rents and an increase in tithes to the Episcopal clergy, superimposed on the religious and civil disabilities of the Presbyterians, together with the partial failure of three successive harvests after 1724, brought on a general exodus from Belfast to South Carolina.[69] Hardly a ship cleared North Ireland ports that was not crowded with men, women, and children bound for America. In 1734 these emigrés founded Williamsburg on the Black River and Camden on the Wateree, while others directed their steps to the Indian district of Waxhaws on the Santee.[70] During the Revolution these settlements were the nemesis of Colonel Rawdon of the British Volunteers of Ireland, whose hopes for recruits in this area on the basis of common nationality proved so illusory.

In 1773, when the *Britannia* entered with a full cargo of passengers, Charleston became a counterpart of Philadelphia. The indigence of these people and those who followed excited such pity that to relieve their dire poverty Reverend Mr. Tennent delivered a charity sermon in the independent meetinghouse at which upwards of 525 pounds currency was contributed for distribution by Tennent among the most needy. And a sermon of like character and purpose was scheduled for St. Michael's Church.[71] With new arrivals, appeals to charity were renewed. In June another charity sermon by Reverend Robert Cooper, rector of St. Michael's, realized more than 750 pounds currency,[72] but late August brought 300 from Londonderry, to be followed in a fortnight by 120 more, and the arrival of other vessels was anticipated. Immigration to Carolina continued unabated possibly because people in Ireland were not yet aware that land was not to be had as readily as formerly.[73] Charleston's congestion and social headaches were accentuated by 250 arrivals from Londonderry in November and 200 from Newry in January;[74] a small contingent of indigents came from Georgia in March,[75] and there were still others from North Ireland. The editor of the *South Carolina Gazette* deplored the inability to check the immigration. But all in vain, for December brought more from Belfast and Newry, and February 1775 still more.

---

[68] *Ibid.*, p. 471.

[69] Ramsay, *South Carolina*, Vol. 1, pp. 108-09.

[70] *Ibid.*, pp. 87-88.

[71] *South Carolina Gazette*, January 21, 1773.

If there were any Catholics in this multitude, they were quickly made to realize how unwelcome they were, for in November 1774 the anti-Catholic English custom of celebrating Pope Day was revived in Charleston. In fact, there were two celebrations, one for adults and another for juveniles; and to add solemnity they were staged in front of one of the churches. By the thousands Charleston's inhabitants turned out to applaud this crude travesty and derision of the pope.[76]

Pope Day might be shrugged off as traditional funmaking, now largely devoid of its original significance, even though the idea of its revival originated in the Masonic headquarters, but that simple interpretation did not apply to another incident. Pregnant with significance and dire foreboding to Catholics was the Dealey-Hubart affair in 1775, recorded in detail by John Drayton. Though Drayton admits that there were few Catholics and no Catholic priest in South Carolina at the time, a drunken brawl and personal altercation involving two Catholics, James Dealey and Laughlin Martin, and a certain Michael Hubart, probably a Huguenot, was deliberately magnified into a miniature Guy Fawkes conspiracy. Apart from the fact that the public gave credence to the accusation that Catholics were leagued in conspiracy with Indians and Negroes against their Protestant neighbors, the occurrence takes on more particular meaning from the connivance and complicity of leaders in the province, who included such distinguished men as William Henry Drayton, Arthur Middleton, and Charles Cotesworth Pinckney. For on the back of the paper submitted to the Secret Committee, Drayton wrote "Secret—tar and feather him" [Martin] and "send away" [Dealey]; and a disguised hand, now attributed to Edward Weyman, endorsed it "Passed by the Secret Committee & ordered to be put into execution."[77] Accordingly the two defenseless Catholics were stripped, tarred and feathered—a form of punishment without precedent in South Carolina—carted through the streets, and put aboard a ship to be deported to England. In the end Martin was reprieved as the Committee had ordained, and discharged after "contrition in a most public manner"; but as an example to other Catholics no clemency was shown to Dealey, and the decree of banishment was enforced. Edward McCrady, the historian of South Carolina, censures Drayton for the reason that, after he repudiated the suggestion that this travesty of justice could have been the fruit of intemperate zeal on the part of the populace, he refused to disavow responsibility for it, gave it unqualified approval, made the Secret Committee, of which he was chairman, fully accountable, and strove to justify such arbitrary and outrageous conduct.[78]

---

[72] *Ibid.*, June 28, 1773.

[73] *Ibid.*, September 15, 1773.

[74] *Ibid.*, November 1, 1773, January 17, 1774.

[75] *Ibid.*, March 14, 1774.

[76] *Ibid.*, November 21, 1774.

---

[77] John Drayton, *Memoirs of the American Revolution*, Vol. 1, pp. 301-02. 2 vols. Charleston, 1821.

[78] McCrady, *South Carolina*, pp. 23-25.

In addition to such inquisitorial procedure, new precautions against Catholics were taken in the form of exclusion from office embodied in the new state constitution of 1778. Nevertheless, in the *Gazette of the State of South Carolina* we encounter such Irish names as O'Neille, M'Ginnis, Donavan, Flanagan, Kennedy, M'Gill, and Burk. What was the religion of these men? Were they Catholics cowed by fear, and driven to conceal the faith so abhorred by those around them, or were they simply not of that faith.[79] Events had proved that their fewness did not guarantee to Catholics immunity to molestation or even elementary personal security. Given the religious climate of Charleston, a delicate situation developed when the French frigate *Iphigenie* docked in 1779 and the crew was given shore leave. The worst was feared, for these men were French and Catholic. Clashes of a serious character must have been anticipated, for the editor of the *Gazette* regarded it as remarkable that, while foreign sailors walked the streets, nothing untoward transpired. One can detect his sense of relief when the ship had sailed and the tension was at once terminated.[80]

At this time there were no organized Protestant churches or resident ministers beyond the Appalachian Mountains, but David McClure maintains that the few white people in the region were, generally speaking, Scotch-Irish Presbyterians, either natives of North Ireland or their descendants, who had pushed westward from the middle colonies; and there were also some Germans and English.[81] Obviously he prescinds from the French settlements in Illinois, Indiana, and elsewhere. At very rare intervals one might come across a Catholic Irishman even in this remote region. Such must have been Tom O'Brien, a member of an expedition headed by Nicholas Cresswell in 1775. If Tom's conduct in the face of danger did scant credit to him, his faith was genuine even if, on his own admission, he lived in disregard of its maxims. Remorse for an evil life may well have unnerved him when death and judgment seemed imminent. He was brutally frank and honest when he ascribed his terror to the fact that "he was not fit for death."[82]

---

[79] "If John Burk, taylor (supposed to be in the back woods) son of James Burk, Barashanna in the north of Ireland is yet alive, and will apply to Capt. James Smith in Barbadoes, he will receive 1000£ sterling, an English stallion and many other valuables" (*Gazette Extraordinary of the State of South Carolina*, September 18, 1775).

[80] *Gazette of the State of South Carolina*, November 3, 1779.

[81] McClure, *Diary*, pp. 47, 112.

From this accumulation of evidence we can see no escape from the conclusion of Maginnis that it is simply impossible for anyone to say what portion of the Irish people in the colonies at the beginning of the Revolution was Catholic.[83] Equally impossible is it to state what soldiers with Irish names were Catholic, but the evidence forces the conclusion that the majority of them were not of that faith. Our curiosity is often aroused, only to be frustrated. Of what religion were the American officers Quin, King, and Power, who journeyed with Doctor John Berkenhout?[84] Of what religion was poor Patrick Carny, one of Major General Sullivan's waggoners, who, a victim of the current savage military discipline, was subjected to five hundred lashes and cashiered for the paltry offense of pilfering five shirts?[85] Conjecture is futile; mere guesses give us no real knowledge. But one inference is fully warranted, that an Irish name is by no means a certain clue to an individual's religion. And Griffin had abundant justification for his supposition that "the Irish in the Revolution whom our orators laud were, with some notable exceptions, Presbyterians."[86]

---

[82] Cresswell, *Journal*, pp. 92-93.

[83] Thomas H. Maginnis, *The Irish Contribution to America's Independence*, p. 86. Philadelphia, 1913.

[84] Berkenhout, *Journal*, p. 89.

[85] *Pennsylvania Packet*, November 24, 1778.

[86] Griffin, "Irish Catholics and the Revolution," p. 341.

CHAPTER IX

Maryland Catholics in the Revolution

We have explored the religious climate in the colonies of pre-Revolution days; we have examined the attitude of the Protestant majority towards the Catholic minority; and we have assessed the ratio of Catholics to the entire population. While we canvassed the whole colonial period, our attention was focused on the status of Catholics on the very eve of the Revolution, with emphasis on Pennsylvania and Maryland, where most of them lived. This extended investigation was essential to an understanding and evaluation of the complex problems which faced Catholics when the Declaration of Independence made a choice of loyalties not only inevitable but urgent.

The picture that emerged is dark, relieved only partially by the situation in Pennsylvania; for, apart from that colony, Catholics were everywhere in open disfavor. A downtrodden group, the objects of suspicion, they were the victims of periodic persecution in one form or another. Denied some of the rights and privileges of citizenship in each of the colonies, excluded from office and social rank, the victims moreover of restrictive legislation, they experienced with the passing of years an accumulation of grievances. The knowledge that they were only tolerated by the dominant Protestants, merely suffered to exist, was not conducive to close relations between the two groups; most certainly this consciousness was not calculated to foster ready acceptance by Catholics of Protestant views or plans; quite the contrary, it was an obstacle to acceptance of any political scheme they might devise. Thus it came about that the Catholics had ample grounds for coolness to any cause or venture espoused and furthered by their Protestant neighbors. A gulf separated the two groups. In a sense Catholics lacked an incentive to embrace the patriot cause; certainly they knew no obligation to do so. Neutrality seemed the logical and the preferable course.

Today, as we view the American Revolution in perspective, we are in a position to appraise it with cold objectivity, but to the Catholics of 1776 this was quite impossible. If, despite the advantages we enjoy, scholars still differ as to the weight of the several contributing causes, added difficulties plagued the generation that witnessed the break with England and the setting up of a new government. To them, particularly if they were Catholics, a choice of sides was far from simple. The implications of the severance of time-honored ties, the repudiation of hallowed loyalties, and vivid memory of opposition and open hostility extending through generations served as deterrents to their ranging themselves on the side of the new leaders who proclaimed a new liberty. If the past had been hard, what might the future bring under a regime in which individuals conspicuous for anti-Catholic sentiments were vested with authority? What reason was there for assuming that the recent outcry against the Quebec Act would not be re-echoed if occasion should arise? Just what did the newly declared independence imply now or in the future for Catholics in the realm of religious profession and practice?

As they surveyed the past, Catholics were conscious of no debt of gratitude to those of other faiths, except perhaps in Pennsylvania. Would the Declaration of Independence alter human nature so radically as to cancel the past? How would the patriots, if successful in their enterprise, implement their power in the sphere of religion? Since the liberal religious enactments of the Quebec Act had recently aroused a storm of protest and denunciation, was there any likelihood that the new state would adopt a policy equally as liberal and enlightened? Indeed, Catholics faced a host of uncertainties; their anxieties were both numerous and very real. Even if they were not especially indebted to the government of George III, the past seemed to preclude wholehearted cooperation with the new leaders in America. If Catholics had decided to abide by established loyalties, they could have advanced the conduct of their own countrymen as excuse and justification. And yet, despite the past with its penalties and grievances, Catholics by and large did espouse the patriot cause and distinguish themselves in its defense, George Bancroft to the contrary notwithstanding. What factors elicited this response, a surprising response under the circumstances? In our quest for an answer it is proper that we look to Maryland because of the number of Catholics in that state, and for the reason that, as they were so largely of English stock, they would comprehend the issues at stake better than their coreligionists in Pennsylvania, among whom Germans were very numerous. Finally, most of the Catholics who achieved distinction in the conflict were citizens of Maryland; but even for a Maryland Catholic the decision was not so simple as to be foreordained or predictable.

In a previous chapter we dwelt on the controversy between Daniel Dulany and Charles Carroll, and we saw how Carroll emerged the victor in a debate which involved a religious issue, despite Dulany's wanton appeal to religious prejudice.[1] By dissenters and Catholics alike, Carroll was hailed as a hero, as their spokesman and the champion of religious freedom. This public acclaim was a personal triumph of the first magnitude; it was a tribute to Carroll's character, an endorsement of his conduct; but in itself it implied no radical modification of attitude towards his belief, no abatement of antagonism. In addition to this personal popularity, Carroll's wealth gave him a prominence enjoyed by no other Catholic. And since his fellow Catholics trusted his judgment and esteemed his integrity, any commitment by him on the issue of 1776 would have far-reaching consequences. Why then, we ask, did Charles Carroll, whose father at one time meditated removal to French or Spanish territory, choose the patriot cause, and how did his choice affect Catholics in Maryland and elsewhere?

---

[1] Metzger, *Quebec Act*, p. 35 note.

An explanation, albeit one that is far-fetched, of the motivation of Charles Carroll and of Catholics in general was attempted by the Episcopalian clergyman Reverend Jonathan Boucher, whose acquaintance we made in connection with his sermon "On Toleration of Papists." Some two decades later, in a book on the causes and consequences of the American Revolution published in London,[2] Boucher endeavored to account for the espousal by Carroll and Catholics of the "patriot" cause. One must bear in mind that Boucher wrote in retrospect, that it is doubtful whether he knew Carroll personally, and that exile from America because of his Tory sentiments embittered his spirit and influenced his views. In short, his attempt at clarification can be accepted only with reservations. In reality it does injustice to Carroll.

According to Boucher, Catholics at first were perplexed, hesitant, divided, and leaderless. Should they repudiate a government whose legitimacy they had never questioned hitherto, sever hallowed ties, and renounce British authority? Should they or could they profess neutrality? If they could not blink the fact that England's enemies were in many cases notoriously hostile to Catholics, it was soon apparent that neutrality was not possible and that loyalism would engender persecution without a guarantee of effective protection by England. Moreover, even delay would intensify suspicion and lead to renewed violence. Catholics were truly at the parting of the way.

---

[2] Boucher, *American Revolution.*

At this juncture, so Boucher assures us, Charles Carroll, whom he dubs the "Duke of Norfolk of America," entered the arena of politics and assumed leadership of his coreligionists. In taking this step, Boucher contends, Carroll was actuated by "his desire to become a public man." Obviously the English divine is quite arbitrary in imputing such a motive to Carroll, even if he admits that Carroll was fully qualified to play his new role. At any rate, Carroll's championing of the patriot party influenced the Catholics to such a degree that, according to Boucher, outwardly at least they became ardent Whigs and, as is characteristic of converts to a new cause, zealots in its defense. As an instance of this new and intemperate zeal Boucher asserts that one of them turned informer and testified against him. In this account the Anglican clergyman appears to accept the false canon that from the conduct of one person the character or sentiments of a whole group can be deduced. To soothe his ruffled feelings Boucher indulged the reflection that Catholic gains could not have been substantial, for, while they saved their property and escaped exile, still they did not win the trust or respect of their fellow Americans. In his chagrin over the turn of events in America he extracted a morsel of comfort from the consideration that Catholics wielded little influence in government circles. While he exonerated them from the guilt of initiating the rebellion, he denounced them for lack of courage to resist it; though they were not "refractory or turbulent" citizens, they were now expiating their guilt in living under a government they could not "cordially approve."

However sincere Boucher may have been, he erred in indulging in oversimplification of a complex situation. For one thing, Charles Carroll was not then or later a scheming politician intent on power or social advancement, as Boucher charged or implied. In reality Carroll's reasons for endorsing the patriot cause were honorable and such as to do him credit; mere political ambition played no part in his choice. Moreover, Catholics were not a unified group which one man, even Charles Carroll, could commit to a course of action. They were scattered, inarticulate, out of touch with one another. Consequently, while Carroll's choice may have ended the vacillation of some, it cannot be advanced as the sole cause or determining reason for the stand taken by Catholics. Various influences were at work, so that many Catholics on their own initiative came to a decision independently of Carroll, and some of them to a decision utterly at variance with his. Moreover, on the surface Boucher's diagnosis of the situation appears to be a left-handed compliment to Maryland Catholics, inasmuch as it intimates that uniformity of attitude and conduct was deemed indispensable for them and that individuals were incapable of acting unless led and shepherded like dumb beasts.

Charles Carroll's brilliant triumph over so prominent an adversary as Daniel Dulany had unlooked-for consequences. Shocked into realization of the impropriety of disfranchisement and disbarment of Carroll from office merely because of his religious convictions, Carroll's supporters took steps to remove the basis for Dulany's caustic taunt. When the election to the Assembly in May proved to be a landslide for the patriot party, the victory was ascribed to Carroll. In recognition of their indebtedness to him William Paca and Mathias Hammond, in an open letter in the *Maryland Gazette* of May 27, 1773, acknowledged their gratitude. In its turn the legislature demonstrated as a body at Carroll's home. This was but the beginning of distinctions heaped on Carroll; demonstrations on a grander scale would follow. And thus the door was opened for Catholics to play a part above that of private soldier in the Revolution that was in the offing.

At a meeting of the inhabitants of Anne Arundel County and the city of Annapolis on November 9, 1774, Carroll was chosen a member of the committee to enforce the Association instituted by the Continental Congress.[3] In quick succession he was made a member of the Committee of Correspondence, and presently found himself in the unique position of delegate of an overwhelmingly Protestant constituency in the provincial convention.[4] Nor did Carroll's neighbors repent of their acts, for on September 12, 1775, his membership on the Committee of Correspondence was renewed,[5] and the next day he was advanced to the committee to license suits in the county, the appointment to hold for one year.[6] Indeed, a new day was dawning in Maryland when Protestant voters chose a Catholic as their representative and confirmed their choice by re-election. Granted that these offices were local, national honors were also imminent.

In 1776 national recognition came to Charles Carroll, and to his cousin Father John Carroll as well. On February 14 Richard Smith, a member of the Continental Congress, recorded in his diary that it had been proposed that two members be sent, together with "Charles Carroll, Esq. and John Carroll a Popish priest both of Maryland," to Canada to bring about a "confirmation of friendship," and to "induce a coincidence with our Measures."[7] Additional information on this project is furnished by a letter of John Adams to James Warren on February 18.[8] Writing from Philadelphia, Adams dwelt at length on the dispositions and abilities of the two Catholics from Maryland and on their fitness for the task entrusted to them. Adams noted that he was impressed by the "conversation" of Charles Carroll, to whom he had been introduced some eighteen months previous to his writing; and he computed Carroll's wealth at £200,000. Among Carroll's attainments and qualifications for the mission to Canada, Adams listed his education in France, his consequent understanding of the French mind and familiarity with their customs, and his perfect command of the French language, which he was said to speak as readily as English. There follows an observation unusual for one who had gloried in the fewness and impotence of Catholics in Adams' home town of Braintree—"they were as rare as a comet or earthquake" and they "dared not assert themselves." For Adams added that "what is perhaps of more Consequence than all the rest, he was educated in the Roman Catholic religion and still continues to worship his Maker according to the Rites of that Church." Obviously Adams must have had in mind the effect this circumstance might have on the Canadians. Continuing his appraisal, Adams credits Carroll with such "zeal, fortitude and perseverance" in the cause of American liberty that he is marked for vengeance by the "Friends of Administration," but, though aware of the peril, he hazards his vast fortune and his very life in the cause. Adams predicts that Carroll will "hereafter make a great Figure in America" because he combines ability with erudition, as is evidenced by his writings, to which Adams had given careful study. In conclusion Adams adds the prophetic remark, "You may perhaps hear before long more about him."

---

[3] Elihu Riley, *The Ancient City—History of Annapolis in Maryland*, p. 170. Annapolis, 1887.

[4] McSherry, *Maryland*, p. 179.

[5] Riley, *Ancient City*, p. 176.

[6] *Ibid.*

[7] Burnett, *Letters*, Vol. 1, p. 350.

[8] *Warren-Adams Letters*, Vol. 1, p. 207. 2 vols. Boston 1917; *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, Vol. 73. Boston 1925.

After this estimate of Charles Carroll, Adams turned to John Carroll, whom he depicted as "a Roman Catholic Priest, and a Jesuit, a Gentleman of learning and Abilities." John Carroll, so Adams thought, was to "administer Baptism to the Canadian Children and bestow Absolution on Such as have been refused it by the toryfied priests in Canada. . . . The Anathemas of the Church," he explains, "so terrible to the Canadians having a disagreeable Effect upon them." Parenthetically we may remark that in his narrative and reasoning the doughty Puritan betrays profound ignorance, as one should expect, of Catholic practice and procedure in respect to jurisdiction and the conferring of the sacraments.

The fortunes of the ill-starred mission to Canada and the reason for its dismal failure lie beyond the scope of our investigation. Suffice it to say that Charles and John Carroll were zealous and discreet and that the failure of the undertaking was in no way due to them; factors beyond their control doomed the venture in advance and humbled the members of the delegation. A by-product of the episode was a genuine friendship between Franklin and Father John Carroll, due to the gentle and self-sacrificing care which the priest accorded Franklin during a serious illness. Franklin deeply appreciated the kindness and devotion of the priest, and his gratitude endured.

The miscarriage of the mission to Canada worked no diminution in the popularity of Charles Carroll in Maryland. On July 4, 1776, after his return, as representative of the city of Annapolis, a community in which Catholics were few, he sat in Congress and served on many committees.[9] Of prime significance is the fact that the liberal spirit which prompted the Protestants of Annapolis to elect Carroll to office did not quickly evaporate or vanish with the termination of hostilities. Quite the contrary, it embraced Catholics less well-known than Carroll, for we are informed that in the twelve elections between 1777 and 1787 Anthanasius Ford and Edmund Plowden were consistently re-elected to represent the county in which Annapolis lay.[10] This liberal spirit may explain why the Maryland Assembly in its denunciation of the Quebec Act had refrained from mention of popery.

---

[9] Peter Force, editor, *American Archives*, fifth series, Vol. 3, p. 89. 9 vols. Washington, 1837-1853.

[10] Philip A. Crowl, *Maryland during and after the Revolution*, p. 38. Baltimore, 1943.

The extraordinary collaboration of Protestants and Catholics, especially when augmented by a group labeled by the Tories "enterprising politicians," proved irresistible. Presenting a solid front, they overrode all opposition and forced the severance of ties with England, the acceptance of the Declaration of Independence, and the founding of the new state. Overwhelmed with reverses and despairing of the future, many Tories of wealth and social prominence took fright and withdrew from the state,[11] Dulany among them.

But the presence of Charles Carroll in the national legislature galled narrow-minded Protestants tinged with Toryism or disaffection to the new government. Thus Jacob Duché, at one time chaplain to Congress and later an open Tory, in a letter to Washington[12] bewailed the fact that America and Congress had deteriorated so much that Maryland no longer sent a Protestant to the assembly.[13] And General Conway, when enmeshed in intrigue, protested to General Gates that Carroll's staunch loyalty to Washington was neither "roman nor Catholick."[14]

With the Catholics of Maryland concentrated so largely in St. Mary's and Charles counties, obviously it is upon these two areas that we fix our attention in a study of Catholic participation in the Revolution. Of the two counties St. Mary's will command special interest because Catholics appear to have been more numerous in that locality. No further discussion of their ratio to the total population is called for; but on the assumption that they were a considerable element we should look for indications and instances of their activity. Nor are we disappointed, for from the very outset they participated in civil and military life. In our inquiry we must rely largely on the records of the Catholic parishes of the region. Unfortunately, as we saw, a good portion of them have perished or are lost; of those that survive some are so fragmentary as to be worthless for our purpose; but the "Diary 1768-1794" for Newton and St. Inigoes Manor by Father James Walton, and the "Almanac and Diary" of Father Arnold Lievers for the same communities are most helpful. They enable the investigator to establish beyond cavil the Catholicity of many men who figured in local or state civil and military activities. Supplemented by county and state records, these glimpses of parochial life enable us to arrange the parts into a composite whole.

---

[11] Griffith, *Sketches*, p. 70.

[12] Worthington C. Ford, editor, *The Washington-Duché Letters*, p. 16. Brooklyn, 1890.

[13] For the details of Charles Carroll's activity in the Continental Congress and his signing of the Declaration of Independence, we must refer the reader to the standard biographies of the man.

[14] Burnett, *Letters*, Vol. 3, p. 278 note.

Late in 1775 no less than thirteen Catholics were members of the General Committee for St. Mary's County,[15] and the Committee of Correspondence likewise counted Catholic members in the persons of Athanasius Ford and Jeremiah Jordan. In August 1776 the Committee of Elections certified the election of Ignatius Fenwick and George Plater to the convention of delegates from the counties and districts of Maryland.[16] When Maryland repudiated allegiance to George III and proclaimed herself an independent and free state, a constitution to replace the colonial charter had to be framed. In the convention which achieved this purpose St. Mary's County was represented by Ignatius Fenwick among others;[17] and when the raising of seven companies of infantry and two of artillery was authorized, Henry Neale became third lieutenant of the fifth company, which was recruited locally.[18]

---

[15] James W. Thomas, *Chronicles of Colonial Maryland*, p. 340. Cumberland, 1913. They were—

William Neale
Athanasius Ford
Maffey Leigh
Edward Fenwick
Henry Carroll
Nicholas Sewell
John Fenwick
John Greenwell of Ignatius
Ignatius Combs
William Jenkins, Jr.
Enoch Fenwick
Ignatius Taylor
Nicholas L. Sewell

[16] Force, *American Archives*, fifth series, Vol. 3, p. 84.

[17] McSherry, *Maryland*, p. 401.

To appraise the contribution of St. Mary's and Charles counties to the national cause it is necessary to grasp the significance of the militia in the scheme of defense, for here more than elsewhere the militia constituted a prime branch of the military arm. St. Mary's and Charles counties were very productive agricultural areas; they produced a surplus of grain, tobacco, meats, and general provisions on which Washington's forces relied at times. For this reason they were the objects of special enemy attention and subjected to periodic British raids designed to destroy these supplies or carry them off to British camps; and the extensive broken coastline and many inlets made them particularly vulnerable, alluring to the enemy, and difficult to defend. Obviously the burden of defense would rest primarily on the militia, who were recruited from the inhabitants. Since this was true, we should expect that Catholics were very numerous in the militia of these counties, perhaps more numerous than in the regular troops, the so-called Continentals, for they were needed to repel incursions into their very homeland.

And this expectation is confirmed by the records. By January 1776 the militia of St. Mary's County was organized into an upper battalion under Colonel Jeremiah Jordan and a lower commanded by Colonel Richard Barnes.[19] In the latter group Ignatius Fenwick, Jr., ranked as first major, and Samuel Abell as second major. And the Maryland Council of Safety records the disbursement in August 1776 of various sums to Majors Ignatius and Philip Fenwick and Captain Fenwick as payment for men on militia duty,[20] while in August, November, and December like amounts were issued to Captain Galbraith, whose Catholic subordinates in dramatic fashion had opened the Catholic church in Baltimore for Sunday services.

---

[18] Scharf, *Maryland*, Vol. 2, p. 192.

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 194.

[20] Journal of Correspondence of Maryland Council of Safety, *Archives of Maryland*, pp. 215, 232, 240. Baltimore, 1893.

As one scans the official lists of Maryland's soldiers in the Revolution, he is amazed at the frequency of the name Ignatius. Among the militia it occurs 92 times, among the regular troops 38 times, a total of 130 appearances.[21] If we break down the first figure on the basis of county, we find that 47 of the men named Ignatius hailed from St. Mary's County, 31 from Charles County, and only 14 from the remainder of the state; and application of the same criterion to the regulars discloses 13 from St. Mary's, 7 from Charles, and 14 from the other counties.[22] Confirmation is found in the lists of the officers of the militia regiments, where Ignatius occurs 30 times. Other sources reveal still more soldiers named Ignatius.[23] The first United States Census of 1790 assigns to Maryland a total of 63 men named Ignatius—34 to St. Mary's County, 20 to Charles, and 9 to Prince George. This frequency of a not-too-common name is a phenomenon which calls for comment and explanation, and it may well be that it will provide a clue to the religion of the men so named.

When we bear in mind that at the outbreak of the Revolution the Catholic priests in Maryland, almost without exception, were men who, previous to the suppression of the Society of Jesus by Pope Clement XIV in June 1773, were members of the religious order founded by St. Ignatius Loyola, an explanation for the prevalence of the name Ignatius is suggested. Devotion to St. Ignatius, the early Christian martyr of Antioch, was nonexistent in the colonies; but the Jesuits were zealous in promoting devotion to their founder, and one phase of this devotion might well be urging their parishioners to give the name of Ignatius to their infant sons in baptism. Protestants in general must have known of Ignatius the Jesuit. Although the average man may have been unaware that Reverend Jonathan Mayhew esteemed Vulcan, Osiris, Hercules, Aesculapius, Romulus, and Rhadamanthus at least as worthy as Ignatius of Loyola "to be enrolled among the gods"; although the niceties of this display of classical erudition would have been lost on the multitude, not one of whom could match Mayhew in invective, Protestant men and women had imbibed such animus towards the founder of the Jesuits that they would have shrunk with horror from even the most remote association with the man and his name. Since Loyola and all his works were anathema, it is unthinkable that they would inflict his name on their offspring.

---

[21] Index of Names, Revolutionary War; Militia Lists; Regular Troops, Manuscripts, Maryland Historical Society.

[22] Another list assigns 26 to St. Mary's, 12 to Charles in a total of 58.

[23] *Archives of Maryland*, Vol. 16, p. 106. Elder; p. 342. Craycraft; Force, *American Archives*, fifth series III, p. 17, Moore.

Consequently it would seem a valid conclusion, and one warranted by our knowledge of Protestant sentiments, that the name Ignatius bespeaks the Catholicity of one so christened, or rather that of his father. Above all this would hold true for St. Mary's and Charles counties, where Jesuits had served as parish priests practically without interruption since the inception of the colony in 1634. Moreover, confirmation of the inference is found in the fact that many of the soldiers named Ignatius found entrance into the pages of the surviving Catholic parish records of St. Mary's and Charles counties, where their baptism or marriage or the baptism of their children or slaves is recorded. For these reasons we feel that we are on solid ground if we assume that every man named Ignatius was a Catholic. The same sources appear to justify the deduction that the Fenwick, Spalding, Mattingly, Neale, and Plowden soldiers were likewise Catholics, whatever their Christian name.

Outstanding among the regiments put into the field by Maryland was that of Colonel William Smallwood, organized even before the Declaration of Independence. Since it was recruited chiefly in the lower counties and on the east shore, it would contain a goodly Catholic element. In its ranks were Ignatius Douglass, Clement, Edward, and John Edelen, Ignatius Boon, John Neale, Joseph Mattingly, Francis and William Baggott.[24] On July 6, 1776, Colonel Smallwood received orders to march to Philadelphia and place his regiment at the disposal of Congress.[25] Simultaneously the independent companies of St. Mary's, Talbot, Kent, and Queen Anne counties were directed to proceed at once to Philadelphia and unite with Colonel Smallwood. The integration of these several groups enabled the regiment thus formed to march into Philadelphia "eleven hundred strong."[26] Congress quickly dispatched the regiment to General Washington, so hard pressed by the enemy. Before it could be whipped into a well-knit, fully trained fighting force, Smallwood's contingent was thrown into the Battle of Long Island, where it was overwhelmed by a British attack and cut to pieces. So great were its losses then and in subsequent operations that by the end of the Princeton campaign it was said to have been reduced to a mere sixty men under Colonel Stone—prison ships and graves held the others.[27] Nevertheless the unit continued to exist, for brigade orders on August 10, 1777, announced "Divine Service at 10 o'clock, every soldier to be neat and Clean and the greatest Decency to be observed."[28] No clue is offered as to the denominational character of the service.

We have explained why St. Mary's and Charles counties were the butt of British raids. Ex-governor John Murray Dunmore of Virginia was especially addicted to this type of warfare. To meet this menace a mobile force known as "the Flying Camp" was instituted. Apparently it was a branch of the militia, for on July 27, 1776, Samuel Chase and Charles Carroll wrote from Congress to the Maryland Council expressing the opinion that "as the harvest is now over" the militia will "come in fast to compose the Flying Camp,"[29] and they entertained the hope that the Maryland militia would march "with all possible expedition." On the testimony of Ignatius Fenwick, on July 28, 1776,[30] the Maryland Flying Camp included the Catholics Edward Mattingly, Ignatius Sims, Edward Spalding, Ignatius Knott, Ignatius Watkin or Walthen, Luke Cusick, and others.[31]

---

[24] *Archives of Maryland*, Vol. 18, pp. 5-20. Baltimore, 1900. There was an Ignatius Baggot from Charles County in the Maryland militia, and a soldier of the same name, perhaps the same individual, served under Captain Cawood.

[25] Thomas, *Colonial Maryland*, p. 241.

[26] *American Catholic Historical Researches*, Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia, Vol. 17, p. 162.

[27] *Ibid.*

[28] Kirkwood, *Journal*, p. 136.

That the menace of raids on southern Maryland was genuine is established by a petition of October 7, 1776, submitted by John Drury, senior and junior, Francis Drury, Ignatius Moore, and Nicholas Moore, all Catholics, and of others of unknown faith, praying for compensation for ejection from their homes and possessions on St. George's Island by a British squadron under Lord Dunmore.[32] This raid was one of a series of such incursions. That Washington was unable to offer protection to every area exposed to British attacks was apparent, and yet resistance was necessary to protect lives and property and to prevent the enemy from establishing new beachheads. Hence the expedient of enrolling the inhabitants of a locality in the militia to fight literally for hearth and home. This, moreover, was the function for which the militia originally came into existence.

In the various militia regiments one encounters numbers of men whose Catholicity is beyond doubt. How many others there were of the same faith it is impossible to say. At any rate, it is undeniable that Catholics, far from faltering, sprang to arms in such numbers that travelers,[33] Tories, and the enemy were impressed. In Captain Alex McPherson's company, to cite an instance, Henry Boarman was lieutenant; Edward Boarman, Jr., sergeant; Raphael Boarman, corporal; Ignatius Francis Garner, ensign; Joseph and William Boarman, and Henry, Thomas, and Ignatius Mudd, and Richard Spalding, privates.[34] Similarly, under Captain Yates, John Neale served as second lieutenant, Raphael Boarman as ensign, and William Neale, Joseph Neale, and Ignatius, Richard B., and William Boarman as privates;[35] and serving under Captain Burnham were Raphael Boarman, Jr., John Boarman, and Zachariah Mattingly.[36] In scanning the records one adverts to the liberal representation of the Boarman, Fenwick, and Spalding families; one notices too that the same name appears in duplicate, possibly because one company gave way to another or because the records are not precise in designating father and son.

---

[29] *Archives of Maryland*, Vol. 12, p. 120.

[30] Ignatius Fenwick was versatile and ubiquitous; he discharged an array of offices at times scarcely compatible. He was a militia officer, member of various civil committees, justice of the county court. Some of the confusion in regard to his multiple activities may be due to a lack of distinguishing in the records between the senior and the junior Ignatius Fenwick.

[31] Muster Rolls and Other Records of Service of Maryland Troops in the American Revolution, unpublished, p. 30. Baltimore, 1900.

[32] Force, *American Archives*, fifth series, Vol. 3, p. 117.

As the war dragged on, the threat to life and property in St. Mary's and Charles counties grew apace; raids increased in frequency and destructiveness. Britain's dominance of American waters enabled her naval forces to move about at will and to launch a raid when and where she wished; and military considerations counseled attacks on the actual or potential supplies of America's fighting forces. Moreover, such intermittent raids would produce a bad psychological effect in the inhabitants. Thus southern Maryland was marked for assault. In response to the crisis men enlisted in increasing numbers, so that the upper battalion of St. Mary's County came to number 770 and the lower

---

[33] Cresswell, *Journal*, p. 266.

[34] Maryland Revolutionary War, Militia Lists, Manuscripts, Maryland Historical Society, p. 40.

[35] *Ibid.*, p. 48.

[36] *Ibid.*, p. 43.

777, a total of 1547.[37] This must have come close to involving the entire available man power of the county. By August 1777 the roster of officers of the two battalions lists a remarkable number of Catholics, the greater number in the lower unit. Some uncertainty exists in respect to the upper battalion, inasmuch as one source lists Jeremiah Jordan as colonel[38] while another assigns the rank to Ignatius Fenwick;[39] but all make Edmund Plowden captain and Edward Mattingly lieutenant. Catholics had risen to commanding rank in these branches of the armed forces.

In the lower battalion the number of Catholics is still more impressive. They constituted the whole cadre of officers, with Ignatius Fenwick colonel, Ignatius Taylor major, Ignatius Abell captain, Philip Fenwick first lieutenant, and Ignatius Combs and Bennet Combs second lieutenants.[40] There may have been others, for there are substantial grounds for holding that Captain John Greenwell, Lieutenant Thomas Jenkins, and Ensigns George Leigh and Robert Jarboe were of the same faith. Most conspicuous was the Abell relationship—there were a captain and three lieutenants of that name. From the preponderance of Catholics among the officers may one infer that the majority of the privates were also Catholics? From what we know of the current method of recruiting and organizing a militia regiment, and for that matter any company or regiment, it seems permissible to conclude that the majority of the privates shared the faith of the officers. And if there were 777 in the group, it would follow that hundreds of Catholic men in St. Mary's County were under arms. Still other Catholics in the militia of St. Mary's County were Athanasius Thompson, Athanasius Joy, two by the name of Cuthbert Abell, Cuthbert Clarke, Cuthbert Fenwick, Cuthbert Smoot,

---

[37] *Ibid.*, p. 161.

[38] Thomas, *Colonial Maryland*, p. 342.

[39] Maryland Revolutionary War Commissions, Maryland Historical Society.

[40] Thomas, *Colonial Maryland*, p. 342; *Archives of Maryland*, Vol. 16, p. 346.

Basil Howard, Basil Bright, Basil Hall, and Basil Brooke.[41] Indeed, St. Mary's men flocked to the militia in astonishing numbers. Even so, in March 1778 the state legislature ordained the raising of 2,902 additional soldiers, with 140 allotted as St. Mary's quota.[42] The conclusion is inescapable: the Catholic men of St. Mary's were not apathetic or delinquent in their duty. They ignored or condoned the past with its discrimination and injustices; and their loyalty was not merely verbal but was substantiated through action and sacrifice.

Moreover, in 1778, when a pledge of allegiance, fidelity, and support of Maryland was required of all free males over eighteen, the oath was administered by "the worshipfull" Bennet Briscoe, himself a Catholic.[43] In every respect the Catholics of Maryland measured up to the demands of patriotism; in this they yielded precedence to no other creed, group, or locality, even though George Bancroft, without proof or evidence to support his allegation, gave currency to the contrary persuasion.

So far, in the interest of clarity, we have largely restricted ourselves to a consideration of the Catholics of St. Mary's County, with occasional excursions into other areas. But complete isolation of that county was impossible, for county boundaries were artificial, members of the same relationship resided in both St. Mary's and Charles counties, and social and commercial intercourse between them was general and continuous. We now turn to Charles County, the second area of greatest Catholic concentration in Maryland. Scholars who have made an analysis of the first federal census of 1790 and used it as a basis for estimates of previous population figures, allocate 1,800 males over eighteen to Charles County in 1776.[44] Obviously this number would include men incapacitated by age, ill health, and physical or mental disability, and perhaps slaves, so that the number of potential fighting men must have been considerably less. To an even greater degree than in St. Mary's County certain family names abound in the records. For example, the patriot oath or oath of allegiance was subscribed to by no less than 21 of the name of Boarman,[45] 14 named Mudd, and 13 named Spalding, all Catholics. Charles County had its Neale and Purcell families, and an Ignatius Adams. The recurrence of the name Ignatius, and its import, have already been discussed. Charles County Catholics rivaled their neighbors and relatives in the adjacent county in acceptance of the patriot cause and in service in its promotion. Pension lists, to cite one proof, put them in the Maryland Line as well as the militia, with a greater number enrolled in the regular army, for Charles County was somewhat less vulnerable to British raids than St. Mary's. Thus, Sergeant Bennet Mudd and Sergeant Jeremiah Mudd were regulars wounded in action, and Privates Richard Mudd, Richard Fenwick, George Spalding, Henry Spalding, and Aaron Spalding served in the Maryland Line. A Daniel Spalding saw marine service, and William Fenwick is classified as captain of militia and privateer.[46]

---

[41] Maryland Militia Lists, Manuscripts, Maryland Historical Society.

[42] Scharf, *Maryland*, Vol. 2, p. 344.

[43] Among those who complied with the requirement were—George Gough, William Spalding, Richard Fenwick, John Baptist Dant, Edward Fenwick, Benjamin Mattingly, Ignatius Combs, Philip Spalding, John Coad, Thomas Jenkins, John Jenkins (Margaret Hodges, *Unpublished Revolutionary Records of Maryland*, Vol. 6. [6 vols. 1939-1941]).

At times the jumbling together of soldiers from several counties complicates the task of allocating them to their proper counties. An instance is the tabulation of men from upper and lower Zachiah, Mattawoman in Charles County, and Bryantown in St. Mary's. Nevertheless, even such lists attest the military service of a substantial number of Catholic men.[47]

---

[44] Greene and Harrington, *American Population*, p. 133 note.

[45] They were Charles, Clement, Edward, Edward, Jr., Garrard, Henry, Henry, Jr., Ignatius, John, Joseph, Leonard, R. Bennet, Raphael, Jr., Raphael, Sr., Richard, Thos. Jas., Jr., Thomas Jas., Sr., Walter, William, Jr., William, Sr., William (Hodges, *Revolutionary Records*, Vol. 5, pp. 102-03).

[46] Harry W. Newman, *Maryland Revolutionary Records.* Washington, 1938.

Warfare is a hazardous undertaking. Inevitably there are casualties, and grief over the capture, wounding, or death of a loved one. On February 13, 1778, Annapolis was shocked by a report that Captain Ignatius Fenwick had "fallen into the Enemy's Hands,"[48] a report happily proved groundless within a week.[49] Others were less fortunate; some were made prisoners, some suffered wounds, some succumbed to disease, while others died on the battlefield. The enemy too bore witness to the supreme sacrifice of many Catholic sons of Maryland, even when they indulged in exaggeration of the effectiveness of British arms. When Major Baurmeister wrote from Philadelphia to Colonel von Junkeen on May 10, 1778, he exulted over the ravages sustained by Maryland and he belittled her people. According to him Maryland could contribute little or nothing to the enemy cause because her inhabitants, accustomed to a life of ease and luxury, were unequal to the demands of war. Much of the land, he boasted, was no longer under cultivation, and trade was completely paralyzed. For these reasons neither provisions nor money, at one time plentiful, could any longer be obtained by the forces under Washington. Scarcity and want, he contended, had made a "veritable wilderness of the state."[50]

Without doubt the German officer relied on hearsay, for he wrote from Philadelphia, and the discrepancy between his picture and reality is too glaring to call for disproof. More to our purpose is his corroboration of the heavy casualties, for he affirms that those who took up arms two years ago have died with few exceptions. While this too is a gross exaggeration if the militia is included, if the German officer had only Smallwood's regiment in mind, it is all too true. And among the casualties were many Catholic men and boys. That the militia of St. Mary's County maintained full strength through enlistments is indicated by its strength in 1780, when 318 men were in service under Captains Jordan, Mattingly, Plowden, and Ignatius Abell.[51] Evidently the devotion of Maryland Catholics to the cause of American liberty was steadfast; it was not mere lip service; it was translated into action, it survived losses.

---

[47] Boarman, Boone, Boswell, Bowling, Brook, Burch, Butler, Carrico[go], Cook, Dent, Dyer, Edelin, Fenwick, Gardiner (6 columns), Hill, Jameson, Jenkins, Langley, Middleton, Montgomery, Mudd (4 columns), Osburn, Procter, Queen, Richards, Spalding, Stewart, Thompson, Wood.

[48] Journal of Correspondence of the Council of Safety, *Archives of Maryland*, Vol. 16, p. 494.

[49] *Ibid.*, Vol. 16, p. 511.

[50] Carl Leopold Baurmeister, *Letters to Colonel von Junkeen Written during the Philadelphia Campaign, 1777-1778*, edited by Bernhard A. Uhlendorf and Edna Vosper, pp. 55-56. Philadelphia, 1937.

Soldiers must be fed as well as armed. A commissariat is as essential to an army as artillery. The morale of an armed force, the strategy of a commander, and the issue of a campaign often hinge on the capacity and success of those who provide food and other necessaries. If the commissariat breaks down, an army may be immobilized, and if this situation is prolonged, disintegration and collapse may ensue. Valley Forge illustrates this fundamental of military science. Throughout the American Revolution the obtaining and forwarding of supplies was a crucial problem, and on more than one occasion the breakdown of the commissariat condemned Washington to inaction or to strategy he would not have pursued under other circumstances. Since supply was in large part a problem of transportation, common sense dictated drawing on regions not too remote from the scene of operations and possessed of an abundance. Thus attention was focused on Maryland. Major Baurmeister to the contrary notwithstanding, Maryland remained a plentiful granary and source of provisions for American forces despite British raids and depredations.

---

[51] Hodges, *Revolutionary Records*, Vol. 2, pp. 12-13.

Militia too must be provisioned when on active service. But since they operate in their own home country, they cannot subsist by plundering as an enemy may do; and yet they must rely on the neighborhood for what is needed. Supplies do not grow spontaneously or assemble by magic. Systematically they must be grown, gathered, forwarded, and apportioned by authorized persons who can guarantee payment. Hence official agents come into the picture. In August 1779 Thomas Johnson, the first governor of the new state of Maryland, directed Ignatius Craycraft of St. Mary's County to purchase "a number of Black Cattle for Public Use,"[52] and by way of explanation he added that they would be wanted by the militia "who is to march." Craycraft was informed that, while the government for the present could not supply him with cash "because the Treasury was being removed," all purchases made by him would be acknowledged and paid in due time. He should buy "what Beef Cattle you can in St. Mary's County. . . . You cannot get too many at moderate Prices." Once again Baurmeister is refuted. Maryland was not a "wilderness" devoid of people and provisions. She was fully able to feed her soldier sons and have a surplus for the needs of others.

The system of purchasing devised by Governor Johnson was continued by Thomas Sim Lee, his successor as chief executive from 1779 to 1783. A startling increase in desertions from the American army spurred Governor Lee to do his utmost to check this trend by forwarding men and supplies to Washington. This became Lee's chief and most engrossing care,[53] and after the French alliance the project took on new proportions because the French forces also relied, in part at least, on American supplies. To expedite the gathering of provisions and to control expenditures Lee had recourse to authorized agents to expand the system. In December 1779 he appointed Joseph Ford agent for St. Mary's and Calvert counties, and Thomas Richardson for Montgomery, Prince George, Charles, and St. Mary's.[54] The assignment of two agents to St. Mary's suggests the volume of supplies anticipated from the area. Additional burdens were placed on Governor Lee's shoulders in 1780, when the British raided the Chesapeake region on a wide scale.[55] St. Mary's County bore the brunt of this assault.

---

[52] *Archives of Maryland*, Vol. 16, p. 342.

[53] Matthew Page Andrews, *Maryland*, p. 374.

Attached to each of the Catholic parishes in Maryland was a manor or group of manors, the produce of which was designed to support the pastor, while sale of surplus commodities would provide for the upkeep of the church and other buildings. If the manor were extensive, the surplus of grain, tobacco, and livestock might be considerable, and in the war years hard-pressed official purchasing agents did not overlook these likely sources of relief. An entry in the Newtown residence memorandum book for 1779 registers the sale of 200 pounds of bacon to the army at 3.6d per pound.[56] St. Thomas Manor disposed of much produce in this manner. The entries for 1780 in the cash book list quantity and price for numerous transactions with Daniel Jenifer, Jr.[57] There were sales of 34 bushels of wheat, 123 bushels of wheat, 2,275 pounds of beef, 5,910 pounds of tobacco, 2,700 pounds of beef, 22⅔ bushels of wheat, 256½ bushels of wheat. Likewise at Port Tobacco, Father Hunter sold provisions to the American army. These citations reveal that the Catholic church manors helped to feed the army and militia. The enemy, who was cognizant of this fact, took counter measures to destroy this source of supply. John Carroll assures us that British ships "often landed at and hovered continually near the plantations of the clergy," pillaged their houses, and slaughtered or requisitioned their livestock.[58]

---

[54] *Maryland Journal and Baltimore Advertiser*, December 14, 1779.

[55] T. J. C. Williams, continued by Folger McKinsey, *History of Frederick County, Maryland*, Vol. 1, p. 118. 2 vols. Frederick, 1910.

[56] *Woodstock Letters*, Vol. 42, number 2, p. 147.

[57] *Ibid.*, p. 146.

Victim of one such destructive inroad by the British was Father Hunter of Port Tobacco, who, as we saw, disposed of a surplus of provisions to the American army. And it was well that he had done so, for a letter from Governor Lee to Lafayette reveals that six enemy ships put raiding parties ashore which burned Colonel Barnes's home on St. Mary's River and "priest Hunter's house at the mouth of Tobacco Creek."[59] These enemy forays must have been frequent and ruinous to the victims, for in 1785 Father Ashton, procurator or treasurer of the quondam Jesuits, thanked Father Walton of St. Inigoe's Manor "for the account of the stock," which, he remarks, "considering the calamities of war is surprising."[60] Between the lines we read that this particular manor must have suffered grave losses, thus sustaining John Carroll's indictment of British military tactics. In a very true sense, then, the Catholic priests of Maryland, with few exceptions ex-Jesuits, contributed to the patriot cause and suffered in its behalf; and their contributions were substantial and opportune.

These facts and figures garnered from official and private records highlight the inaccuracy and distortion of George Bancroft who asserted[61] that, whereas, "cultivated men of the Roman church, like Carroll, gave hearty support to the cause of independence, the great mass of its members" were either indifferent to the call of their country or hostile. And Bancroft compounds his error and rises to new heights of misrepresentation when he ascribes the assumed unfavorable attitude of Catholics to the "influence of the Jesuits, in whose hands the direction of them still remained, and who alike cherished distrust of the influence of the American Revolution and hatred of France for her share in the overthrow of their order." Here we have the *a priori* argument misapplied. Jesuit "distrust" of the American Revolution, and their "hatred" of France rooted in the memory of that country's part in their suppression are purely gratuitous assumptions; for no proof whatever, not a shred of evidence, is advanced to substantiate this indictment of the Jesuits and the Catholic laity. Despite evidence to the contrary, Bancroft indulged in this bold imputing of motives. Contemporaries, among them Reverend Jonathan Boucher the Anglican parson, contradict Bancroft and deny his facile supposition.

---

[58] *Ibid.*, pp. 146-47.

[59] *Ibid.*, pp. 147-48; Scharf, *Maryland*, Vol. 2, p. 442.

[60] *Woodstock Letters*, Vol. 42, number 2, p. 147.

[61] George Bancroft, *History of the United States*, Vol. 6, p. 171. 1876 edition.

Relying on this erroneous passage in Bancroft, a more recent writer[62] arbitrarily altered the phrase "the great mass of its members" into the "Catholic Irish" because it suited her purpose in initiating a fictitious contrast between the Catholic Irish and the Presbyterian Irish; and she repeated Bancroft's sneer about baneful Jesuit influence. Apart from other considerations this amplifying of Bancroft betrays ignorance of the fact that in reality Irish Catholics constituted a minority in Maryland as well as in Pennsylvania.

Since the initial settlement in Maryland was made in 1634 within the boundaries of St. Mary's County, it was natural that St. Mary's and adjacent Charles County should become the two chief centers of Catholicity in the colony and state. For this reason Abbé Claude Robin could observe in 1781 that the state "has a great proportion of Catholics among its inhabitants."[63] Elsewhere Catholic communities were much smaller, and often they lacked a church and resident pastor. When Robin made his observation Baltimore was a town of perhaps eight thousand inhabitants, and it boasted Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Lutheran,

---

[62] Margaret Glasgow, *The Scotch-Irish in Northern Ireland and in American Colonies.* New York, 1936.

[63] Robin, *New Travels*, p. 50.

Dutch Calvinist, Baptist, Quaker, and Methodist places of worship, "one for each society," and a Roman Catholic church.[64] It appears that the Catholic church was the place of worship of the Acadian exiles whose extreme indigence was so well known.[65] In addition to the poverty-stricken Acadian exiles there were a few English communicants, but the church on Saratoga Street in the French quarter was small, and services were irregular and contingent on the coming of the chaplain from Charles Carroll's manor or the presence of a priest who happened by. It was not till 1784, after the congregation had grown sufficiently to warrant the step, that Reverend Charles Sewall enlarged the structure and took up residence in Baltimore.[66] In 1779, when J. Flanagan advertised three "parcels of land," respectively fifteen, fourteen, and thirty miles distant from "Baltimore-Town," and as an inducement to purchase, specified that they were all "convenient to Church and Mill," he could scarcely have had in mind the little church established previously by the Acadian exiles.[67]

Fredericktown too boasted of a Catholic church in 1782, but if Popp's Journal is accurate in saying that the inhabitants were mostly Germans from Swabia with some exiled Salsburgers, Catholics would be few.[68] In short, apart from those in the two extreme southern counties, Catholics were so few that their participation in the Revolution would be on a very minor scale, and their activities would merge with those of their more numerous Protestant compatriots and be impossible to detect.

Elsewhere we have dwelt on the number of Catholic priests in the British colonies and the nascent United States. Perhaps the reader has already asked what role they played in the Revolution over and above that already indicated. Lack of evidence makes a categorical answer impossible. If the priests were free in expressing their opinion on the turn of events, their comments have perished. Letter writing is an art rarely cultivated by busy pastors, and the uncertainty attending the fate of letters during hostilities tended to discourage correspondence. Furthermore, the suppression of the Society of Jesus had put an abrupt end to official reports to the headquarters of the order and had interrupted the exchange of personal letters to some degree. In reality, intercourse by letter and meetings was reduced to a minimum. Engrossed in their apostolate, busy priests had little time for the study or discussion of political issues; above all, such subjects had no place in their pulpits. And since the Revolution was ushered in by opposition to the Quebec Act, and that opposition was so largely religious in character, and many leaders of the outcry were now protagonists of the new order, Catholic priests had reason to be reticent. Common prudence suggested that they keep their sentiments to themselves. They could do so without appearing singular. Hitherto they had taken no part in political discussions; they had concentrated on their priestly duties to the exclusion of alien issues, and their abstention from politics may have engendered a lack of interest and disinclination to becoming involved in its intricacies. Far from courting public attention, they had sought to avoid it. For thus abstaining from involvement in nonreligious issues they had won the commendation of their contemporaries, who contrasted their conduct with that of the political-minded ministers in New England pulpits. Small wonder, then, that John Carroll alone won distinction for forthright patriotism, and even this was largely due to the accident of relationship to Charles Carroll and the national exigencies of the moment.

---

[64] Griffith, *Baltimore*, pp. 97-98.

[65] *Magazine of American History*, Vol. 4, number 6, p. 441, June 1880.

[66] Griffith, *Baltimore*, p. 107.

[67] *Maryland Journal*, January 5, 1779.

[68] *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, Vol. 26, p. 251, 1902.

On a minor scale which, as it was local, attracted little attention, another priest served his country effectively. The eastern shore of Maryland was a hotbed of Toryism. Here disaffection to the patriot cause was so rampant and aggressive that a military force was dispatched to the area to intimidate or expel the boldest of the Tories. Despite the prevalence of pro-British sentiment Father Joseph Moseley, who labored there, could aver that, as soon as he understood "the cordial concurrence and consent of the clergy," he lost no time in pledging his "fidelity and allegiance to the state."[69] Moseley's words imply general approbation of the oath by the Catholic clergy. The very silence of Tories and of those unfriendly to Jesuits or to Catholicism is tacit admission of Moseley's contention. Moseley, however, did more than pledge mere personal loyalty, for, assuming the new role of political adviser to his people, he urged them to do as he had done, and "every Catholic . . . not one excepted" followed his example. Such a generalization by Father Moseley would have been impossible unless it corresponded with fact. Otherwise it would have evoked instant challenge and denial.

Father Moseley's testimony to the "cordial concurrence and consent of the clergy" refutes Bancroft's calumny of the Jesuits cited earlier in this chapter. For before the papal suppression of the Society of Jesus, Moseley was a Jesuit, as were, with one or two exceptions, all of the priests exercising the ministry in the United States. Moreover, Moseley's activity in behalf of the patriot cause and his contention that "every Catholic, not one excepted" followed his example in pledging allegiance give the lie to Bancroft's pronouncement that Jesuit influence was applied to the making of Tories and that consequently the great mass of Catholics wound up in the Tory camp. Similarly, the honors conferred on Father Farmer and Father Molyneaux by public authorities in Pennsylvania attest their conviction of the loyalty of the Jesuit priests and demolish Bancroft's gross imputation of disloyalty.[70]

---

[69] *Woodstock Letters*, Vol. 42, number 2, p. 145.

[70] Bancroft's allegation may be traceable to a statement by Barbé-Marbois in a letter to Vergennes dated Philadelphia, August 15, 1784. "Les Catholiques,

This attitude of the priests was not unknown to the enemy, and it may explain in part why the residences and manors of the clergy were special objects of British depredations. Neither could the people have been ignorant of the sentiments of the clergy as a whole, or unaware of their activity. If the loyalty of their priests had been suspect, Catholics generally would have suffered; if any individual's loyalty had been questioned, the clergy as a group would have been discredited; if any doubt had lurked in the minds of the voters, they would at the very least have withheld public positions of trust from all Catholics, imputing to the laity the misdeeds of their spiritual leaders. Proof that Catholics and their clergy were deemed loyal is had in the choice by the electors of the senate in September 1781 of George Plater, Charles Carroll of Carrollton, and Daniel Carroll as state senators for the western shore.[71] Three Catholics in a group of fifteen is a goodly proportion, and it bespeaks unqualified trust. Such conferring of political honor and power is public approbation, at once an endorsement and ecomium of their conduct and a refutation of claims to the contrary. For this approval there were ample grounds.

In short, the Catholics of Maryland yielded to no other religious group in unstinted support of the common cause. A salient fact in their war record was that they contrived to help

---

toujours dirigès par les Jésuites dans ce pais-ci, Msgr, ont été en général mal disposès pour la revolution, Ils ne sont pas mieux pour nous, mais plusiers particulares considerables n'ont pas les mêmes prejugés" (Jules A. Baisnée, *France and the Establishment of the American Hierarchy*, p. 90. [Baltimore, 1934]). Apart from the qualifications of Barbé-Marbois for passing judgment on this matter, the phrase "en général" is an admission that there were exceptions, a restriction disregarded by Bancroft. How Barbé-Marbois could level even this qualified accusation at the Jesuits and the Catholics in the face of what they actually did in the Revolution is a mystery. And if Bancroft was guided by the judgment of Barbé-Marbois a modicum of investigation should have revealed to him that the Frenchman was confuted by the facts.

[71] *Maryland Journal*, September 25, 1781.

in such a variety of ways. As regulars in the Continental Army, as militia, as sailors, as diplomats, as civil officials on a local or state, even a national, level, and as humble providers of food and other essential commodities, they rivaled their neighbors of other faiths.

In one respect alone did they fail—they provided no Catholic chaplain to minister to the spiritual needs of Maryland's Catholic sons in the Continental Army. The small number of priests accounts in part for this failure, but a still more potent factor was the current method of organizing a regiment and choosing a spiritual guide. The chaplain must perforce be of the faith of the majority of the men; and since no regiment of Maryland regulars was exclusively, or even predominantly, Catholic, no Catholic priest was called upon to serve in that capacity. Thus no discredit attaches to this singular fact; faint-heartedness or lack of devotion was not indicated. To the Maryland militia, however, the priests did minister, for these men were members of the flocks entrusted to their care. And besides, as such ministration was usually of short duration because it was contingent on a passing emergency, and since the field of activity as a rule was close at hand, it did not entail much travel or prolonged absence from the parish. Finally, such ministry depended on the invitation or recommendation of the militiamen themselves rather than on approval or appointment by state or national officials. As a consequence militia chaplains are rarely mentioned in official records, and we have no data for checking the activity of the parish priests in this respect because parish records made no distinction between parishioners as civilians or as militia temporarily alerted or in action against the enemy. However, if the priests had been remiss in this respect and had failed their people in their hour of peril such conduct would have evoked immediate comment and criticism of which no trace has been found.

CHAPTER X

Pennsylvania Catholics in the Revolution

Maryland and Pennsylvania differed in many respects, and these dissimilarities are relevant to our inquiry inasmuch as they affected the respective roles of these two communities in the Revolution. While Marylanders were largely a homogeneous people, English in origin, tradition, and outlook, Pennsylvania's population was cosmopolitan in extraction, language, and customs. Here one found English, Germans, Scots, Irish, and Swedes, in addition to individuals of other nationalities. And whereas the Anglican Church dominated in Maryland with consequent restrictions on all who dissented, be they Protestant or Catholic, in Pennsylvania the wide variety of creeds, supplementing the Quaker spirit of forbearance, begot toleration in religion. On the surface there was harmony among the sects. In Pennsylvania, Catholics were happier than elsewhere in the British colonies, for they enjoyed complete freedom of religious practice; in the latitude of this liberty their position was unique in the British North American mainland colonies.

In still other ways Maryland and Pennsylvania were unlike. Thanks to Penn's promotion of his new colony among the quietists of Germany, from its inception the population included a sizable German element, frugal, industrious, and somewhat overawed by oppression in their homeland. In time German

Catholics found a haven in this Quaker colony; by 1776 they seem to have outnumbered Catholics of every other national strain. These Germans, with a background so greatly at variance with that of the English, would not be so sensitive to political wrongs, or so concerned with political issues. They knew no Magna Charta or Bill of Rights, no Coke or Blackstone. Inured to subjection in their fatherland, they were satisfied if they were not molested by the authorities. This they equated with good fortune. Few of them would aspire to active participation in government; few would feel aggrieved if the political privileges, so cherished by Englishmen, were curtailed or denied altogether. A life absorbed in toilsome effort to provide a competence for their families left little time for speculation on the principles of government or the rights of the subject, even if they had been so inclined. By upbringing and the force of circumstances these Germans were not the stuff of which political adventurers and revolutionaries are made. As the pleas of propagandists fell on their ears unaccustomed to such melody they were unmoved; denunciation of British tyranny and appeals to them to rise in defense of their rights were a language many did not heed or comprehend.

Geography too was a prime factor in the relation of Pennsylvania to the war. German communities, such as Lancaster and York, even Philadelphia itself, were relatively immune to British attack. Apart from the one campaign that involved Brandywine and Germantown and the capture of Philadelphia, the state knew little of the fears, uncertainty, and ravages incidental to war. Moreover, the enemy never penetrated far beyond the environs of the capital city, and their possession of the metropolis was brief. In addition, the banks of the Delaware were not so vulnerable to the British raids as the broken coast line of Maryland, which held out attractive opportunities to the enemy and tied down so many Marylanders to home or militia service. Hence in Pennsylvania the need of a militia was never so acute as in Maryland, and the Pennsylvania militia saw limited service apart from the custody and transporting of prisoners of war. If Pennsylvania's sons should enlist, they would join the Continental Army, where in time they were brigaded with regiments from other states and their identity was obscured or wholly lost. This procedure would complicate the task of establishing with any certainty the religious affiliation of these men.

In Pennsylvania, furthermore, there were no such distinctly Catholic areas as St. Mary's and Charles counties in Maryland; and for Pennsylvania we lack records as revealing as those of Father Arnold Lievers and Father James Walton for Maryland Catholics. Retention of a pew in St. Mary's Church in Philadelphia or in a Catholic church elsewhere is a safe clue to the religion of the individual; so too are records of baptism, marriage, or funeral. But rarely is the bridegroom classified as a soldier; as a rule there is no indication of trade or profession. To check the names of Pennsylvania's soldiers against the extensive church records of the state would be interminable and unrewarding. Another obstacle to the identification of the religion of a soldier is the circumstance that membership in a Masonic lodge is no disproof of the Catholicity of the individual, because the several papal prohibitions of membership to Catholics had not been promulgated in British North America, and thus the injunctions had not taken effect. Some Pennsylvania Catholics were also Masons, and the same incongruity was to be found in Maryland. Confirmation of this association of Masonic ties and staunch Catholicity is had in the instance of Captain John Doyle, a Mason and a Catholic, who was buried from St. Mary's Church in Lancaster. Another was James Mease of Philadelphia. All this is tantamount to saying that for many Catholic soldiers of Pennsylvania we cannot attain that satisfying assurance that was possible when we dealt with Maryland's Catholic soldiers.

A brief survey of Pennsylvania and its metropolis in 1776 is imperative. Two features arrest attention, the cosmopolitan character of the population and the multiplicity of creeds, and each contributed to a spirit of forbearance and toleration. Day-by-day intercourse and association of Englishmen, Germans, Welsh, French, Scots, Irish, Dutch, Swedes, and Jews, of white men and Negroes,[1] acted as a solvent to petty racial prejudices. In like manner the mingling of people of diverse creeds dispelled ignorance and called forth a broad-mindedness unknown in New England. Thomas Anburey counted "Churchmen, Quakers, Calvinists, Lutherans, Catholics, Methodists, Menists, Moravians, Independents, Anabaptists, and a sect which perhaps you never heard of, called Dumplers."[2] Given this environment and the religious climate of the eighteenth century, such diversity in nationality and disunity in belief might readily have generated tension, even open strife. Quite the contrary, however, took place, for travelers such as Anburey marveled that, despite the wide range of religious beliefs, such harmony prevailed. So impressed was Anburey that he exclaimed, "Would to God that harmony were equally as prevalent all over the globe."[3] This state of affairs opened the eyes of John Adams when he came to Philadelphia to take part in the deliberations of the Continental Congress, and he was deeply impressed by what he witnessed. To his wife Abigail he expressed his wonderment that the members of the various denominations could meet in the streets after services without abusing one another.

In other ways too the people were unified. Christopher Marshall, a prominent Quaker merchant of Philadelphia, noted that because of the municipal election of 1776 the "Quakers, Papists, Church, Allen family, with all the Proprietary party" were more truly one than ever before.[4] Strange bedfellows, to be sure, yet not unusual in the city. Any attempt of one group to dominate was frustrated by the coalition of the others;[5] equality was sought by all, and equality postulated forbearance; general religious toleration resulted. Perhaps Catholics, to a greater degree than those of any other denomination, were the beneficiaries of this situation, even if there was reluctance to entrust public offices to them. Since religious harmony prevailed, there appeared to have been less emphasis than elsewhere in public records on the creed of the individual, and this in turn adds greatly to our difficulty in determining which soldiers were Catholics.

---

[1] Brunhouse, *Counter Revolution*, p. 4.
[2] Anburey, *Travels*, Vol. 2, pp. 165-66.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 169.

In the propitious religious climate of Pennsylvania, Catholics increased in number, and places of worship multiplied. In Philadelphia, when St. Joseph's Church could no longer accommodate the parishioners, a new congregation was organized, and St. Mary's, a much larger church, was constructed. Conspicuous among the Catholic priests of Pennsylvania were Father Ferdinand Farmer and Father Robert Molyneaux, both active in Philadelphia during the Revolution.[6] Of the two Father Farmer was perhaps the more distinguished. Born Steinmeyer in Germany, he came to America after ordination and changed his name to Farmer. From 1759 till his death on August 17, 1786, he was attached to Saint Joseph's Church.

John Gilmary Shea and Martin I. J. Griffin overlook a number of pertinent considerations in denying to Father Farmer and Father Molyneaux a rightful place among the patriots of the Revolution. Griffin singles out Father Farmer and remarks that "he was no more patriotic than all others in America in his time." Of Father Molyneaux he observes that "not a line or word of his for or against the Revolution has ever been produced."[7] Apropos of these strictures we need only say that, although Father Farmer was overshadowed by Father John Carroll in public service, he nevertheless was unswerving in his devotion to the cause. We must bear in mind that, since Father Farmer was German by birth and upbringing, the niceties of the issues between England and her rebellious colonies may well have been beyond his interest and comprehension. Then too he was too engrossed with his pastoral duties to digress into the byways of politics. He had not done so hitherto; he was not expected to do so now; he and his fellow priests were esteemed as members of the cloth, and just that. They were priests, not politicians, not "pulpit-drum ecclesiastics."

---

[4] Marshall, *Diary*, p. 68.

[5] Morse, *Annals*, p. 198.

[6] Scharf and Westcott, *Philadelphia*, Vol. 2, p. 1372.

When Griffin censures Molyneaux because not a word or line of his in favor of the Revolution has been brought to light, he ignores circumstances. At this time letter writing was not so common as it is today, and it was not the practice of busy priests because the multiplicity of their duties and cares left little time for the cultivation of the social graces. Obviously, then, Molyneaux's letters would be infrequent; and as he abstained from politics, the likelihood of his expressing an opinion on political issues would be reduced to a minimum; furthermore, his correspondence would be subject to the vicissitudes that attend all documents. Why should his views or those of his confrères be committed to writing? Their contemporaries did not demand it, and political discussion was banned from their pulpits. Thus Griffin's negative argument based merely on nonsurvival of written evidence appears to lack validity.

Guilday comes close to endorsing the verdict of Griffin, for while he contends that "it is impossible to find a single priest who was driven out of America for loyalty to the King,"[8] he adds that it would be difficult to show that, apart from Father John Carroll, the Catholic clergy took any active steps in the patriot cause.[9] In short, Guilday appraises Father Farmer and his confrères as indifferent and inactive but not disloyal. His criticism implies the anachronism of transposing today's reaction to the involvement of our country in war to a period when such repercussions were unheard of. Above all it ignores the patriotic activity of Father Joseph Moseley which we recounted in a previous chapter.

---

[7] Martin I, J. Griffin, "Catholic Loyalists of the Revolution," *Catholic Historical Researches*, Vol. 5, pp. 77-88, January 1889.

[8] Guilday, *John Carroll*, p. 81.

The estimate of the contemporaries of Fathers Farmer and Molyneaux should serve as a trustworthy indication of their patriotism or lack of it, since it would be founded on close observation. Judged by this standard, Father Farmer comes off well. Did the men who knew him question his attachment to the cause? Far from it, for, just as in the case of Charles Carroll of Maryland, public approbation by the legislature of the state of Pennsylvania sweeps away the censure of Griffin and the doubt of Guilday. To impugn the patriotism of Father Farmer is to indict the Assembly of Pennsylvania, and that is assuredly preposterous for they were the priest's contemporaries to whom his character and background were no secret.

How did that body express approval of the foreign-born pastor of St. Joseph's Church? On November 27, 1779, the Assembly, as was mentioned, rescinded the charter of the old college, established the University of the State of Pennsylvania, and ordained that the trustees of the new institution should include the "Senior Ministers" of the Lutheran, Episcopal, Presbyterian, Baptist, German Calvinist, and Roman Catholic churches in Philadelphia.[10] By this arrangement, as we saw, Father Farmer, the ex-Jesuit, became probably the first Catholic, and most certainly the first Catholic priest, to hold civil office in

---

[9] *Ibid.*, pp. 82-83.

[10] Johnson, *Nicholas Collin*, p. 99.

Pennsylvania.[11] As the unprecedented designation of Father Farmer as a trustee of the university evoked no protest, it is positive proof that neither the Protestant legislature nor the local ministers of five Protestant denominations associated with him in office disapproved of the enactment or entertained the least misgiving as to Father Farmer's sentiments. The directive with respect to trustees of the university continued in force till 1791, five years after the death of Father Farmer, when the rather strange provision requiring the membership of "Senior Ministers" was dropped.[12]

Molyneaux too won a signal testimonial to his loyalty when he became instructor in English to the Chevalier de la Luzerne. Apropos to this office and the mingling in high society that it entailed, John Carroll later commented cryptically to a correspondent, "As you know his natural taste for elegant life and manners, you may judge of his proficiency."[13] Prescinding from Molyneaux's adaptability to high society and from his competence as a teacher of English, we submit that no man of doubtful attachment to the American cause would have been assigned to this position or permitted to retain it. Once again the judgment of contemporaries who could scrutinize the man must counteract and overrule the conjectures of later writers, and vindicate Father Molyneaux. Obviously, as pastors Fathers Farmer and Molyneaux would assist at the marriage of a Catholic soldier in British service because, as a rule, British regiments on active duty had no chaplain; above all, they had no Catholic chaplains. Rarely do the records of the war period indicate the military character of the groom or his regiment; but several precise entries were found, among them the marriages of a soldier of the British forty-ninth regiment, of a Hessian chasseur, of a private in the seventeenth regiment, and of one described simply as "juvenem militem."[14]

---

[11] Stille, "Religious Tests in Provincial Pennsylvania," pp. 400-01.

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 103.

[13] Letter in Woodstock College Archives. John Carroll, February 20, 1782.

How did the Catholic laity of Pennsylvania react to the crisis? What was their answer to their country's need? Does their conduct compare favorably with that of their coreligionists in the adjacent state of Maryland? Regardless of whether Jonathan Boucher was correct in asserting that in the beginning Maryland Catholics hesitated and awaited a declaration by Charles Carroll or someone of equal prominence, he could not doubt the initial attitude of Pennsylvania Catholics. With an alacrity equaling that of their brethren in Maryland the laity of Pennsylvania sprang to action. Circumstances made Stephen Moylan for Pennsylvania what Charles Carroll was to Maryland, but with the difference that, whereas Carroll served his country in civil offices, Moylan served in various military capacities. That Moylan had attained a degree of prominence and popularity in his community before the outbreak of hostilities was shown when he was chosen the first president of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick when that undenominational fraternal society was organized on March 17, 1771. When Boston's need became known Maryland lost no time in enrolling many of her Catholic sons under Smallwood and rushing them to the aid of the beleaguered city; Pennsylvania with equal promptitude fielded hers under Moylan and Hand, and dispatched them to the same objective. Moylan's contingent, recruited in lower Pennsylvania and Maryland,[15] reached Boston before Hand's troops.[16] These men under Smallwood, Hand, and Moylan must have been the soldiers that Daniel Barber lumped together and designated the "Catholic troops from the south." He had anticipated friction between the Protestant men of New England and the "Catholic troops from the south," but so harmonious did their relations prove to be that Barber's astonishment and satisfaction knew no bounds. At Boston these volunteers from Pennsylvania and Maryland[17] won instant acclaim because of their physique, bearing, and uniform, and above all their uncanny marksmanship.[18] Their accuracy was phenomenal. Such was the toll they reaped among officers that a British officer counseled officers still in England that the doleful prospect of sudden death in America should induce them to settle their affairs and make their wills before embarking,[19] truly a sobering introduction to army life in America.

---

[14] 1777, Dec. 13. Phila. Thomas Sullivan (juvenem militem ex. ag. legione [49th regiment] & Sarah Stormont.

1778, Feb. 20, Michael Ruppert (ex legione Venatorum [chasseurs], Hessian & Catherine Kellerman.

1778, March 12, Robert Rollo (officialem locum tenentem ex Legione) & Anna Allen.

1778, May 5, Ignatius Schneider (juvenem Viennensem Austriacum ex Leg. 17) & Catharine Viel.

August 2, 1783 John O'Donnell juvenem militem Co. Tyrone (Ireland) & Sarah Barnwell, Dublin.

Baptism and Marriage Register of St. Joseph's church, Philadelphia, 1773-1786.

The easy jumbling of English and Latin in the record is fascinating.

---

[15] Emmet, "Irish Emigration during the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," p. 68.

[16] *Ibid.*, pp. 56-70.

[17] "[August 1775] at Cambridge Genl Washington, Genl Lee, Aid de camp Mifflin with a Number of other Gentlemen who were Strangers to me and look'd as if they came from the Southward." *Gage Papers.* American Series, Intelligence Paper.

[18] "Several companies of riflemen, amounting it is said, to more than fourteen hundred men, have arrived from Pennsylvania and Maryland: a distance of from five to seven hundred miles. They are remarkably stout and hardy men; many of them exceeding six feet in height. They are dressed in white frocks, or rifle shirts, and round hats. These men are remarkable for the accuracy of their aim; striking a mark with great certainty at two hundred yards distance. At a review, a company of them, while on quick advance, fired their balls into objects of seven inches diameter, at a distance of two hundred and fifty yards. They are now stationed on our lines, and their shot have frequently proved fatal to British officers and soldiers who expose themselves to view, even at more than double the distance of common musket-shot" (Thacker, *Military Journal*, p. 31).

[19] *The Gun Digest*, 1951, p. 71.

Stephen Moylan (in British dispatches he was Moilan or Moidan), whose remains rest in St. Mary's churchyard in Philadelphia, was the outstanding American Catholic soldier in the Revolution. Nevertheless he has been accorded so little recognition that an appreciation is both relevant and overdue. Moylan was of good Irish stock; his brother was the Catholic bishop of Cork[20] and a staunch friend of America. Always an admirer, and in time a close friend, of Washington, Stephen Moylan recruited and led the body of volunteers just mentioned. In turn he filled the posts of muster-master general of the Continental Army, aide-de-camp to Washington, quartermaster general, member of Washington's staff and his personal secretary, colonel of the Fourth Continental Dragoons, and brigadier general.

When Gage solved the situation at Boston by evacuating the city, the beleaguering American forces were allocated to other areas, chiefly to New York because Washington divined that the British would shortly concentrate their attack on that port in the hope of making it the base of land and naval operations. Its central position and fine harbor made it ideal for their purposes. When Moylan was made muster-master general of the Continental Army on August 11, 1775, and aide-de-camp to Washington on March 6, 1776, he must have relinquished command of the force he had led to the relief of Boston. Very likely it was fused with other brigades. In any event we are not greatly concerned with what became of the contingent, for this is not a military history of the Revolution. What should be obvious to all, however, is the fact that Pennsylvania Catholics did not lag in answering the call of their country, and they were not reluctant to hasten to the succor of a distant community where anti-Catholic sentiment, always rampant, had been so vociferous in denouncing the Quebec Act of recent date.

---

[20] Emmet, "Irish Emigration during the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," p. 13.

Moylan's career in the army reveals his standing with Washington and the Continental Congress. Beset as they were by open and secret enemies, they must have subjected him to thorough scrutiny before they assigned him to key posts. Thus Moylan's appointments testify to their evaluation of the man, to his loyalty and ability, both of which found expression in action on the battlefield, and even in profanity when provoked by the enemy.[21] It scarcely behooves us at this date to challenge the judgment of the commander so noted for circumspection, or of the supreme civil authority of the new nation.

Clashes of personalities are commonplace occurrences in the daily intercourse of men; in wartime, when nerves are taut and frayed, the likelihood of discord increases, particularly if a fighting force includes different nationalities. Under such circumstances tempers may flare and violent words or deeds ensue. In the Revolution, Americans animated by ardent patriotism resented the overbearing conduct and cold calculation of some professional soldiers from Europe who were intent on self-glorification or financial gain; in some instances they detected in them the frauds and adventurers they proved to be. Such imposters may have blinded some Americans to the motives of other volunteers who were inspired by genuine devotion to America. On one occasion Moylan's conduct led to charges being lodged against him. He was accused of disobedience to the orders of a Polish officer of superior rank, of "initiating language" to this officer, and of striking an unarmed Polish soldier, but a court-martial under Colonel Bland found him innocent and acquitted him.[22]

---

[21] "Manly sent in a large ship from Glasgow, bound for Boston—There were a vast number of letters and what is really extraordinary no one that does not breathe enmity, death and destruction to this fair land. G-d damn them" (Col. Moylan to Reed, Cambridge, December 5 [1775], William B. Reed, *Life and Correspondence of Joseph Reed*, Vol. 1, p. 134. [2 vols. Philadelphia, 1847]).

[22] Kirkwood, *Journal*, p. 222.

Washington set high value on the talents of Moylan. To Joseph Reed he expressed his regret that Moylan could no longer serve as his secretary because the commissariat demanded his undivided attention.[23] The commander-in-chief may have taken steps to bring about the appointment of Moylan as an aide-de-camp, for early in March 1776 headquarters announced to the army that Moylan was assigned to this post,[24] a position he was to retain for only three months. A still more burdensome office awaited him. John Hancock, the president of Congress, informed Moylan on June 6 that Congress "from a sense of your merit, and attachment to the American cause" has been pleased to appoint you "Quartermaster General in the Army of the Colonies with the rank of Colonel."[25] The following day the army was notified that Moylan had replaced Thomas Mifflin.[26] At this time the quartermaster's department was not fully organized, and the rank of the incumbent won uncertain recognition. Such circumstances hampered Moylan in the discharge of his duty. That he may have encountered opposition or interference seems a fair inference from the commander's order on August 24 that, if action should take place, Colonel Moylan's orders "are to be considered as coming from the General."[27] This was high commendation, but humdrum service as a noncombatant did not appeal to a fighting man; Moylan tendered his resignation on September 28, and Mifflin was reinstated.[28]

A free man, Moylan could now follow his inclination, and he promptly raised an independent cavalry unit drawn largely from

---

[23] Reed, *Joseph Reed*, Vol. 1, p. 145.

[24] William Henshaw, *The Orderly Book of Colonel William Henshaw*, p. 100. Worcester, 1948.

[25] Force, *American Archives*, fourth series, Vol. 6, p. 723.

[26] Henshaw, *Orderly Book*, p. 148.

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 227.

[28] Burnett, *Letters*, William Ellery to the Governor of Rhode Island, October 5, 1776, Vol. 2, p. 116.

Philadelphia.[29] For obvious reasons he did not attempt to restrict membership to Catholics; we do not know how many of his men were of his faith. Moylan was now in his element. Did he not lead a contingent that would see action? Crossing swords with the enemy was more to his taste than haggling with merchants over prices or with teamsters over terms; neither did he relish being the butt of relentless faultfinding and abuse because he did not work miracles with the meager resources at his command. Apparently, however, this independent cavalry group was shortlived, for it seems to have been merged with other aggregations in the Continental Army. At all events, on January 3, 1777, we find Moylan in command of the Fourth Continental Dragoons, and he was their commander till November 3, 1783. In this capacity he won his military laurels and is best known. Although a flamboyant uniform was designed for the horsemen,[30] it does not appear to have been *de rigeur*. Moylan was not spared the same knotty problems that harassed and exasperated so many other commanders, chiefly bounty jumping and desertion. Again and again Philadelphia newspapers carried notices of deserters from the Dragoons;[31] occasionally humor tinged the description and clues to identification, as when Thomas Smith was said to speak

---

[29] Emmet, "Irish Emigration during the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," p. 188.

[30] *Pennsylvania Packet*, April 15, 1779. "Green coat turned up with red, red waist coat, buckskin breeches, boots, and a leather cap mounted with bearskin."

[31] For example: "Henry Burke . . . has had other clothes, which he will probably wear, particularly a pair of red breeches which he frequently appeared in while in the troop," *Pennsylvania Packet*, April 29, 1777.

"Edward Wilcox . . . by birth an Irishman . . . does not want for good understanding, until he is overpowered with liquor, which he is very subject to . . ." *Pennsylvania Journal*, August 6, 1777.

"James Watson born in New Jersey, Jacob Sights born in Pennsylvania, Abraham Brown born in Ireland, James Anderson born at New Castle, Del., John Ritchy born in Pennsylvania. . . . The above deserters took with them the uniform of the said regiment," *Pennsylvania Packet*, April 15, 1779.

"Dennis O'Hara, a strong well made fellow," *Pennsylvania Packet*, May 8, 1779.

"with the brogue; he is a well made fellow,"[32] Thomas M'Cully to be "much addicted to playing cards," and when Edward Wilcox's habitual intoxication was stressed. Army life was such that many would qualify for these marks of identification.

The activities of Moylan's Dragoons resembled those of Maryland's Flying Corps—routine patrol duty, anticipating and thwarting thrusts of the enemy, disrupting their lines of communication, pursuit of groups engaged in scouting or raiding, rounding up and escorting prisoners. Shifts in location were frequent. Thus, when a British fleet sailed from the Hook for an unknown destination, Washington ordered Moylan to repair in all haste to Philadelphia; he should not lose a moment, his baggage should follow under guard.[33] Another such emergency brought orders to hasten unencumbered to Pompton, as near what is called the Yellow House (Curtis') as possible," and "detach a Captain, two subalterns and 50 Men to the Block House in the Clove, a little beyond Sufferns" and relieve the party there. Furthermore "If you have no Tents, you must get your men under cover in as compact a manner as the nature of the neighboring farm Houses will admit."[34]

When harmony and collaboration were so essential, disagreements sometimes developed between the armed forces and the civil authorities without either party's being particularly at fault. Such a situation arose when Governor Trumbull of Connecticut dispatched to Moylan a "warm letter" over an issue not disclosed. Though irritated and indignant, Moylan maintained self-control and refrained from replying in the same tenor, despite his conviction that the governor was "unwarrantably prejudiced." Moylan's conciliatory spirit evoked praise from Washington, almost meticulous in cultivating harmonious relations between the army and civil authorities.[35] The forbearance and restraint advocated by Washington marked Moylan's correspondence with Governor Reed respecting a request for the names of Pennsylvania men under his command.[36] In turn this fine spirit of cooperation and due subordination enabled Moylan to appeal to the governor when some of his officers were in desperate straits because their pay was in arrears and Continental currency had depreciated,[37] and when a shortage of subalterns threatened the morale and impaired the effectiveness of the regiment.[38]

---

[32] *Pennsylvania Packet*, March 11, 1777; *Pennsylvania Journal*, June 2, 1779.

[33] Washington to Moylan, July 24 [1777]. Photostat in *Archives of the Pennsylvania Historical Society*.

[34] Washington to Moylan, October 22, 1782. Photostat in *Archives of the Pennsylvania Historical Society*.

Moylan was as proud of his men as he was devoted to them; he was concerned with their appearance; he was solicitous for their welfare. This devotedness had its reward when Lieutenant Enos Reeves, in describing a review of the whole army by Washington and the French minister plenipotentiary, commented on the "elegant appearance" of the reviewing staff, escorted by Moylan's Regiment of Light Dragoons.[39] A final summons to action came to the Dragoons in October 1781, after the surrender of Cornwallis, in orders from Washington to detach as many men as possible and have them unite with Major General St. Clair, who was hurrying southward. Furthermore, Moylan should select a competent officer to supervise the "transfer of men, invalids, sick, etc." so as to avoid confusion and delay, "and that misapplication of time and means, which unhappily are too often met with in our service."[40] In reality America's triumph at Yorktown terminated the activity of Moylan and his men, and the reduction of the regiment followed, but Congress was not unmindful of the service rendered by the commander of the Fourth Dragoons. On November 4, 1783, in pursuance of an act of Congress, Colonel Moylan was raised to the rank of brigadier general.[41] At long last he had attained the highest military honor to be conferred on a Catholic son of America in the Revolution. Catholics in Pennsylvania and elsewhere could point with pride to their foremost representative in the armed forces which had won independence.

---

[35] Washington to Moylan, February 3, 1780. Photostat in *Archives of the Pennsylvania Historical Society.*

[36] "Return of the Officers of the 4th Regt Light Dragoons Belonging to the State of Pennsylvania. January 25, 1781," *Archives of the Pennsylvania Historical Society.*

[37] Moylan to Reed, March 4, 1781, *Archives of the Pennsylvania Historical Society.* "The want of breeches and boots, Shirts is beyond description great in the Regt. There are some in the store here which would relieve very much—an order for the articles would be a real public service."

[38] Moylan to his Excellency the President [Reed] July 10, 1781. *Archives of the Pennsylvania Historical Society.*

[39] Reeves, "Extracts from the Letter Books of Lt. Enos Reeves," p. 459, Letter 129.

If the Carrolls of Maryland were conspicuous in upholding the American cause, the Moylans of Pennsylvania were scarcely less outstanding. The services and achievements of these two families alone should serve as refutation of the charge of Catholic apathy, should dispel the least vestige of doubt of their loyalty. In quite various ways three of Stephen Moylan's brothers, James, John, and Jasper, furthered the common cause. About 1778 James became a commercial agent of the United States in France, with headquarters at L'Orient, and when American frigates and privateers preyed successfully on British shipping, even in British home waters, and brought prizes into French ports, he was obliged to undertake the duties of prize agent. In addition he had a hand in fitting out the *Ranger*, the *Alliance*, and the *Bonhomme Richard*, whose exploits spread dismay in British commercial circles and sent insurance rates soaring. Moreover, James helped to forge economic ties between our country and France when such bonds were the very lifeline of an almost insolvent United States. Thus in noncombatant positions

---

[40] Washington to Moylan, October 31, 1781. Photostat in the *Archives of the Pennsylvania Historical Society.*

[41] *Journals of the Continental Congress, 1774-1789*, Vol. 23, p. 466. Photostat in the *Archives of the Pennsylvania Historical Society*, dated November 4, 1783, and signed, Lincoln, secy at war.

James proved himself a worthy emulator of the commander of the Fourth Dragoons. Towards the end of the war John occupied the prosaic post of clothier general of America's fighting forces, while Jasper, after a turn of duty in Spain, became ensign of the Philadelphia Associators in 1781. Truly the Moylan brothers were worthy associates of the Carrolls in zealous devotion to their country. As individuals and as a group they exhibited a patriotism spelled out in sacrifice. The Catholics of Pennsylvania were no less responsive and no less patriotic than those of Maryland.

Another Pennsylvania Catholic who stood out in the Revolution was Thomas Fitz Simmons or Fitzsimmins, a member of St. Joseph's Parish born in Ireland. Before the war he had engaged in commerce and trade. As relations with England deteriorated, publicly and irrevocably he espoused America's ideals and fortune. Like so many others he raised a volunteer company,[42] but it was probably as captain of Colonel John Cadwalader's command that he saw action in the Princeton campaign when he and his men occupied Bristol and Burlington. This seems to have concluded his experience as a combatant; henceforth his talents were applied to other fields no less vital to the success of America's bid for independence. In March or April 1777, when he was appointed to the State Navy Board of Pennsylvania to devise ways and means for the defense of Philadelphia and the Delaware River basin, he promoted the construction of fire ships and the assembling of military stores. In 1779, in an arrangement we have already touched on in connection with Father Farmer, he became a trustee of the revised college or university of Pennsylvania. Likewise in 1779 he was elected an overseer of the poor, the chief victims of currency inflation, rising prices, and the stagnation of business and trade because of the war and the British blockade of American ports. His was the impossible and thankless task of enforcing the regulations designed to prevent "hoarding and engrossing," to fix prices, and to curb speculation in the commodities deemed essential to life and well-being. When Pennsylvania undertook the drawing up of a constitution to replace the now obsolete articles of government of proprietary days, Fitz Simmons was a delegate to the convention. With such a background of incumbency in public office it was most fitting that he should be among the originators and signers of the "Address of Catholics" to Washington after the final victory.[43]

---

[42] Haltigan, *Irish*, p. 179.

George Meade, the brother-in-law of Fitz Simmons, rendered vital assistance to his country when her prospects were at lowest ebb. Before the war the firm of Garrett and George Meade of Philadelphia carried on extensive shipping operations, importing and exporting on a major scale to the West Indies. After Garrett's death or withdrawal George and Thomas Fitz Simmons, who had married Catharine, the only sister of Garrett and George Meade, became associates and thereafter the firm was known as George Meade and Company. The new organization continued to trade with the West Indies, and during the war it engaged in privateering and also helped provision the French naval forces in American waters. At an early date Meade became active in civil and social projects and organizations, among them the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of which he was a charter member. In this fraternal and social organization Catholic and Protestant joined without formality or misgiving in conviviality and merriment; it typified the free and easy intercourse between men of various creeds in Philadelphia.

Always a staunch Catholic, George Meade yielded to no one in patriotism. In 1775 he and Fitz Simmons enrolled the third Philadelphia battalion, a volunteer aggregation, and he was likewise a member of the Associators or Public Defense Association, but he does not appear to have had any experience in actual combat. With the British occupation of Philadelphia imminent he and his family sought safety beyond the enemy lines, to return by September 1778, after the evacuation of the city by General Clinton. Thereafter, just as before this interlude, Meade was active on relief, correspondence, and other committees. It is however for his financial aid to a desperately impoverished Continental Congress that he merits the gratitude of posterity. When Washington's ragged and famished army at Valley Forge was on the verge of disintegrating, Meade subscribed generously to a fund for its relief. This was commendable generosity, for as the prospects of repayment were slight, this was tantamount to an outright gift. Thus, in part, the survival of Washington's army was due to Meade's liberality. While the largest, this was not the only instance of George Meade's largess to his country. Meade did not conceal his Catholicity; he was as active in Catholic as in civic and philanthropic circles, and his benefactions multiplied. When the parish of St. Joseph outgrew the limited accommodations of the small church, he contributed generously to the building of the more commodious St. Mary's Church. Posthumous distinction came to him as grandfather of General George Meade, commander of the victorious Union Army in the decisive Battle of Gettysburg.[44]

---

[43] Guilday, *John Carroll*, p. 365.

A less sterling Catholic patriot was James Mease, also a merchant and shipper. On the occasion of the public subscription to relieve Washington's army and sustain the solvency of the government mentioned above, James Mease subscribed 5,000 and John Mease 4,000 pounds sterling, truly most generous contributions.[45] Unfortunately, this is not the whole story of James Mease's financial transactions with the government of the United

---

[44] In 1782 George Meade held a pew at St. Mary's. *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*, Vol. 4, p. 258.

[45] Scharf and Westcott, *Philadelphia*, Vol. 1, p. 409 note.

States.[46] He was not above sharp financial practice of very dubious character. After Arnold's treason a document came to light in Philadelphia, an agreement entered into by James Mease, a certain William West, and Benedict Arnold when the last was military commander of the city.[47] It was, in short, a scheme to dispose of surplus or unwanted military supplies to the exclusive enriching of the three subscribers. Mease's signature on the document dispels all doubt of his involvement. If this is not outright conspiracy to defraud the government and to advance Mease's personal interests at public expense, it is certainly a plot to appropriate and divert public property to private gain, an artifice that a truly honest man and a patriot would disdain. Honesty is ever the hallmark of the true patriot. The current desperate financial need of the government aggravates the guilt of all concerned. The whole sordid affair casts a dark shadow on the public spirit of James Mease.

Joseph Cauffman was a Catholic physician who made the supreme sacrifice for his country. From Vienna he wrote to Franklin on April 23, 1777,[48] expressing his wish as an American to serve his country. At the same time he confided to Franklin his conviction that the circumstance of his being a Catholic would not prove an obstacle to his "doing the duty of an honest and worthy citizen." He simply could not conceive that the men who directed America would thwart his desire "for so trivial a reason." The ready response of Catholics and the current governmental policy of accepting their assistance in every form ruled out such a supposition. Cauffman realized his wish, and in 1778 he found himself surgeon on the frigate *Randolph* under Captain Nicholas Biddle. On March 7 the *Randolph* engaged the British cruiser *Yarmouth* off Barbados. In the height of battle, while Cauffman was attending Captain Biddle, who was wounded in the thigh, the *Randolph*, already badly battered, blew up when her sister ship, the *Moultrie*, mistaking her identity, poured a volley into her. This tragic error sent Cauffman and the crew of the *Randolph* to watery graves. In dying Cauffman proved himself a worthy citizen. He had not found his religion in any sense an obstacle to patriotism or that it lessened his love of country in the least degree.

---

[46] In James Mease we have additional confirmation of what was said about the possibility of an individual being simultaneously a Catholic and a Mason. Roster of the Freemasons Lodge Philadelphia No. 2 of the Moderns, p. 25. "Mease, James—made a Mason, June 18, 1760" (*Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, January 1907).

[47] "Whereas, by purchasing goods and necessaries for the use of the public, sundry articles, not wanted for the purpose, may be obtained, it is agreed by the subscribers that all such goods and merchandize which are or may be bought by the clothier-general, or persons appointed by him, shall be sold for the joint benefit of the subscribers, and be purchased at their risk. Witness our hands, this twenty third day of June, 1778.

B. Arnold
James Mease
Wm. West"

Scharf and Westcott, *Philadelphia*, Vol. 1, p. 390.

[48] Cauffman to Franklin, April 23, 1777, *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*, Vol. 21, pp. 77-82.

A salient feature of the part played in the Revolution by the Catholics of Philadelphia is the number of St. Mary's parishioners who took to seafaring, either in the United States Navy or in its auxiliary service of privateering. Foremost among these mariners was Captain John Barry who, successively in the *Lexington*, *Effingham*, *Raleigh*, *Delaware*, and *Alliance*, phantom-like was to be encountered anywhere on the Atlantic and adjacent waters. Again and again his stratagems and expert seamanship and knowledge of the waters he plied enabled him to execute hairbreadth escapes, elude pursuers, or pounce on unsuspecting prey. His exploits thrilled his contemporaries, and as happens in such circumstances, they gave birth to a host of legends and beliefs, among them that of his being heir to the title of "Father of the United States Navy." Since biographers have already presented detailed accounts of his career, we need not rehearse or enlarge on what has been written.

The majority of St. Mary's sons, however, engaged in privateering. Common usage sanctioned the issuance, by the federal and state governments, of letters of "marque and reprisal" to privately owned commercial vessels, authorizing them to prey on enemy commerce. Supply ships and transports were their special target. No less than fourteen pewholders, or men who were later buried from St. Mary's, with two possible additions, challenged British control of the seas.[49] This is a remarkable showing; one suspects that nearly all of the seagoing vessels operated by these men must have been included. Of the captains and masters Thomas Flahavan stands out. We note the total absence of German and the preponderance of Irish names. St. Mary's men rendered worthwhile service in this minor field of operations, which lacked the organization essential to the full realization of its potentialities for wreaking vengeance on the enemy.

The efficiency of the Pennsylvania Line as a fighting unit has been extolled by all, but no little controversy has raged over its composition and the number of Catholics in its ranks. In general, scholars agree with Anburey's impression[50] that the Scots and Irish predominated, but they differ on the issue of whether the rank and file were recent immigrants or of older stock. Bancroft is held responsible[51] for giving currency to the legend that the newcomers of the 1770's flocked to the colors and constituted the major part of the Line. As proof he advanced "the alleged lawlessness and disaffection of the men at the time of the revolt," and that General Harry Lee, in confirmation, had cited "the extraordinary brilliancy of their courage on the battlefield."

---

[49] *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*, Vol. 40, pp. 116-18, June 1949.

[50] Anburey, *Travels*, Vol. 2, pp. 289-90. "They passed thro' Frederick Town last month, and appeared to be mostly Scotch and Irish . . . with a great number of blacks."

[51] Charles J. Stille, *Major General Wayne and the Pennsylvania Line*, p. 248. Philadelphia, 1893.

These arguments lack cogency; they seem to be a *non sequitur*. But Bancroft set a pattern which later writers copied, although Bancroft merely echoed an opinion already voiced by others. For example, Mathew Carey maintained that "a band of Irishmen embodied to avenge in the country of their adoption the injuries of the country of their birthplace. They formed the major part of the celebrated Pennsylvania Line."[52] Did the motive advanced by Carey really operate with such force on the Irishmen recently come to America that they outstripped earlier arrivals in the determination to settle old scores with England? To be sure, the grievances of the Irish were both perennial and cumulative; each decade added its quota of disagreements and wrongs. And insofar as their memory would be more vivid, these newcomers may have felt a stronger impulse to vengeful action than those whose spirit had mellowed somewhat with the lapse of time and longer residence in the New World. And yet it is unlikely that the two groups would vary in their antagonism towards England save in the degree of its intensity and acrimony, and that disparity would scarcely constitute a major factor in enlisting.

The somewhat doubtful assumption of Bancroft and of those who followed in his footsteps was already challenged by a soldier in the Line. Using his own company as illustration, Alexander Graydon states[53] that it included twenty from Ireland, four from England, two from Scotland, two from Germany, and forty-five Americans. In addition there were four American officers. This observation leaves no place for ambiguity as to which national strain enjoyed numerical supremacy in this segment of the Line, and indirectly it intimates that the men were not Catholics. In evident disregard of arithmetic Graydon allots the Irish "a little more than a fourth" of his company. Was Graydon's company singular? It appears unlikely that the composition of other companies should have varied greatly from that in which Graydon served as private.

---

[52] Mathew Carey, *The Olive Branch or Faults on Both Sides*, Vol. 2, p. 169. 2 vols. Philadelphia, 1815.

[53] Graydon, *Memoirs*, p. 181.

Thorough study convinced Charles Stille[54] that Bancroft was wrong in one respect, to wit, that, while two-thirds of the Line were Scotch-Irish, the majority were the descendants of the immigrants of 1717-1730, not the more recent arrivals brought to America by the flood tide of immigration from Ireland in the early seventies. By 1776 these descendants of the earlier migration would be second, even third, generation, somewhat blended with other blood strains, and so they could be classified simply as Americans. Stille is upheld in his contention by John Blair Linn, coeditor of the *Pennsylvania Archives* and a foremost authority on the history of Pennsylvania during the Revolution. Linn's knowledge of the records was unsurpassed. In a letter[55] to Stille, which the latter incorporated into his biography of Major General Wayne, Linn contends that Bancroft erred. He insists that the recent Irish arrivals were not the "bone and sinew" of the Line, that the presence of a respectable number of Germans is established by the military rolls of Bucks, Lancaster, Chester, and Northampton counties, and that there were also some sons of English immigrants in the Line. Pension rolls establish the predominance of Scotch-Irish; but old church records reveal the presence of not a few who came to the New World between 1769 and 1774. Thus Linn qualifies Stille's statement by the admission that each group of Irish was represented; but he holds that the annals of Pennsylvania offer no proof that the Irish, as distinct from the Scotch-Irish, constituted the major part of the Line, but much evidence proves the contrary.

In turn William H. Egle, state librarian and the associate of Linn in editing the *Pennsylvania Archives*, says that the

---

[54] Stille, *Major General Wayne*, p. 248.

[55] Letter of John Blair Linn, editor of *the Archives of the Pennsylvania Historical Society*, Bellefonte, April 11, 1892; Stille, *Major General Wayne*, pp. 249-50.

Scotch-Irish "formed about two thirds" of the Line, and the remainder were "almost wholly of German parentage."[56] Egle, as is apparent, allots the Germans a more generous representation than other scholars. With reference to the Catholic Irish, Egle continues, "I doubt if there were 300 persons of Irish birth (Roman Catholic and Celtic) in the war from Pennsylvania." Stille altered the phrase "in the war" to "in the Pennsylvania Line," a change justified by the circumstance that the specific subject of inquiry was the composition of the Line, not that of Pennsylvania's troops as a whole.

Since editorial work made Egle thoroughly conversant with the records of Pennsylvania that pertain to the American Revolution, some comments on his opinion are in order. It should be borne in mind that Egle, according to Stille's emendation, restricts his analysis to the Catholic Irish in the Line, that he is silent as to the total number of Catholics among Pennsylvania troops, and that he prescinds entirely from the Catholic Irish in other branches of the armed services such as cavalry, militia, privateers, navy, even from other infantry divisions in whose rosters Irish names are found. Instances abound, but we note only the Pennsylvania State Regiment of Foot.[57]

Above all we should not forget that in Pennsylvania, Irishmen were by no means alone in professing the Catholic faith. Actually they were outnumbered by German and English by a wide margin. We recollect that, when the Catholic priests in the colony upon official request undertook a census of their communicants for Governor Loudoun in 1757, they listed 629 as German, 285 as Irish, and 180 as Irish or Germans. These figures are semiofficial. We submit that, since one group is labeled Irish or German and no English are tabulated, they must have been included in the figure of the Irish, and for this reason the true Irish were actually fewer than would appear from the census. Egle holds that there was no notable immigration of Irish Catholics till after the Revolution, and in this view scholars concur. If this be true, the ratio that obtained in 1757 was not greatly altered in the two decades before 1776. In other words, in 1776 Irish Catholics in Pennsylvania were less numerous than the Germans and possibly the English, and yet around 300 of them, according to the expert calculation of Egle, were to be found in the Line alone. Assuredly this is a signal testimonial to their patriotism. Further comment is almost superfluous. The fact is eloquent; it is an overwhelming refutation of the statement of Ramsay that, while the Scotch-Irish were almost to a man on the side of independence, the Celtic Irish were largely on the opposite side.[58]

---

[56] Letter of William H. Egle, Pennsylvania State Librarian, Editor of *Archives of the Pennsylvania Historical Society*, Harrisburg, April 11, 1892; Stille, *Major General Wayne*, p. 249.

[57] "Orderly-Book of the Pennsylvania State Regiment of Foot, May 10 to August 16, 1777," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, April 1898, Vol. 22, number 1, p. 57.

Egle's reckoning may serve as basis for further inferences. In a letter to Reverend Mr. Peters on March 19, 1757, Father Robert Harding ascribes to "Mr. Sneider"—Father Schneider whose ministry embraced Philadelphia and adjacent territory—the belief "yt ye whole number of Roman Catholicks, English, Irish and Germans, including men women and children, does not exceed two thousand."[59] This mere approximation by Father Schneider became the more accurate figure of 1,365 in the official report to Governor Loudoun on April 29, 1757, which divided the people almost evenly according to sex, 692 males, 673 females. Obviously the Catholic population of Pennsylvania increased somewhat in the interval between this letter and the Declaration of Independence, but we know no reason for thinking that it doubled, since most of the Irish immigrants

---

[58] Glasgow, *Scotch-Irish*, p. 288.

[59] Letter in *Archives of the Pennsylvania Historical Society.*

during this period hailed from Ulster. Even if the increase was twofold, Catholics should have numbered only from 3,000 to 4,000 in 1776. From this total we must deduct women, children, the superannuated, the disabled, the sick, Negroes, and others disqualified or exempted from military service. Thus we arrive at the figure of perhaps 1,000, at most 1,500 able-bodied Catholic men in Pennsylvania, who constituted the whole potential Catholic man power. And if one segment, the Irish, assuredly much less than one half of the total, contributed around 300 men to just one arm of the service, the Catholics of Pennsylvania are found to have been phenomenally responsive to the bidding of the country. Furthermore, to this number must be added those in other divisions of the armed forces, and the Germans and English in all services. The increment of German and English Catholics should swell the total well beyond a minimum of 500, and that is from 33 to 50 per cent of the entire potential.

This is patriotism written in capital letters. And the magnitude of their achievement is highlighted by the fact that some scholars maintain that in 1776 less than 20 per cent of the population were adult men.

If our figures are accurate, the Catholic communities of Pennsylvania should at times have been largely denuded of their adult and physically fit manhood. Most emphatically, the Catholics of Pennsylvania compiled a brilliant record in serving their country. Given the opportunity, they too confuted the allegation of disloyalty forever hurled at them by many Protestants. Confronted by the facts, the embarrassment of their accusers should have been so profound that silence or a change of heart ensued. Further to insinuate the impossibility of patriotism because of the tenets of their Catholic creed was a distortion of fact so glaring that it discredited and stultified the critic. A new assessment was required, an adjustment to reality; but so ingrained was anti-Catholic prejudice in some hearts that, as we saw in another chapter, even in the pulpit consecrated to dissemination of the word of God some ministers continued to dilate on the miscreant character of priests, the inherent iniquity of popery, and the proclivity of Catholics to deceit and perfidy. To minds distorted and poisoned by extreme prejudice even overwhelming evidence may fail to serve as an antidote. In the Dudleian lectures at Harvard, for example, one seeks in vain for recognition of the actuality so patent to everyone. Distinguished clergymen continued, as formerly, to dole out virulent anti-Catholic sentiments.

CHAPTER XI

Catholic Tories

There are two sides to a medal or coin, the obverse and the reverse; after studying the one, we now fix our attention on the other. Granted that there was a display of enthusiasm for the patriot cause by Catholics in Maryland and Pennsylvania, who responded with alacrity and in unusual numbers to their country's call for defenders, were there also other Catholics who were deaf to this call, whose hearts and ears were attuned to the claims and appeals of those who attacked America? In other words, were there any Catholic Tories? As a prelude to our inquiry some observations on Tories and Toryism are in order.

During the American Revolution, Tories were abhorred even more than the British, for they were regarded as traitors, as foes more ready than the enemy from abroad to inflict harm on their patriot neighbors. We must not lose sight of the fact that the American Revolution was a twofold civil war; for it was not only a conflict between the colonies and England, but also a contest between patriot and Tory, and this minor phase was more bitter than the larger struggle. This internecine conflict, as waged in New Jersey, for example, took on features of cruelty unknown to the fighting between Red Coat and Continental. Small wonder, then, that as the strife wore on Tories came to be hated with an intensity the European enemy was spared; and the heritage of this enmity was bequeathed by the generation of 1776 to their descendants.

In turn the so-called "patriotic school" of historians reinforced and perpetuated the tradition, and in this they were aided by bombastic Fourth of July orators and other perfervid exponents of patriotism who substituted emotion for truth and accuracy. In their opinion Tories without exception were criminals, the very scum of humanity because no decent person could have opposed the effort to secure liberty. Hence they were damned *en masse*. This attitude has undergone radical change within the last two generations, when scholars have become more intent on ascertaining the facts than in rehearsing legends and sustaining hoary prejudices. From the vantage point of today we can survey the period with greater detachment. Time has calmed emotions, and we now realize that not all patriots were heroes, nor all Tories villains. To be sure, there have been those who went to the other extreme of extolling Tories and disparaging patriots. Novelists, among others, have said or intimated that all people of wealth, education, culture, and social standing espoused the British side, while in the patriot camp were ranged the lowborn and unlettered, rag, tag, and bobtail, the mob craving the possessions of opulent Tory neighbors or hopeful of climbing to power and social position in the turmoil of war. Even as a generalization this contention is so completely at variance with reality that it overreaches itself and calls for no refutation.

The judgments of men differ in outlook no less than in aptitude. We are acquainted with the conservative, the liberal, the radical; and these types obtain in war as well as in peace. That there should be Tories was foreordained. Had there been none, we should be confronted with the phenomenon of a unanimity unique in the history of mankind. To the poet Alexander Pope is attributed the couplet " 'Tis with our judgments as our watches; none go just alike, yet each believes his own."

As the war clouds gathered on the horizon the conservative mind reacted in one way, the liberal mind in another.[1] Although the conservative businessman disapproved of certain British commercial regulations, he was inclined to submit to them, or simply to ignore them by nonobservance whenever possible, rather than risk the rupture of established business ties and face the uncertainties incidental to an appeal to arms. Even if America should succeed in her venture, he envisioned a situation so unstable that the status quo was preferable. To the conservative in politics the overthrow of British rule, which would involve the displacement of an established, experienced official class and the substitution of men who were novices in politics and wholly inexperienced in diplomacy, boded ill for the country. Men of substance, faced with a threat to their possessions, reckoned the old order the lesser of two evils. Religious-minded men might contrast British authority as it prevailed since the founding of Jamestown with the prospect of emerging from the conflict as the satellite or appendage of a non-British government. Under the circumstances this could be only France or Spain, the traditional enemies of Protestant England, "papist" in religion and "despotic" in government; and as they could not conceive of America as able to stand on her own feet, the specter appalled them. Moreover, new men, parvenus in every sense, were now insisting that men grown gray as subjects of his majesty should disregard their oath of office or foreswear an allegiance they had always gloried in and accepted as a moral duty. In the words of Tom Paine, these were times that tried men's souls. Confronted with the dilemma and forced to make a choice because the Declaration of Independence ruled out neutrality, conservative minds might well elect to abide by the old order rather than hazard the new.

---

[1] Jameson, *Social Movement,* passim.

For Catholics, over and above these considerations, there was still another of uncommon cogency. Throughout the colonial period, as we saw, Catholics had been victims of discrimination, often of open persecution, at the hands of the authorities of their respective communities. Nowhere had they been accorded the full privileges of citizenship; everywhere they were distrusted and restricted. And many of the men in the forefront of the movement for independence had been active and articulate in opposition to what they disdainfully styled "popery" and "papist." Did this augur well for Catholics? If the separatist movement should triumph and the same individuals found themselves vested with authority, would they be less hostile to Catholics? Would the lot of Catholics be bettered if such men had a free hand? With some plausibility it might be argued that the recent Quebec Act denoted a change of attitude towards Catholics in British official circles and promised improvement in their status if Britain should continue to control the colonies. If Catholics had little reason to be grateful to Stuart and Hanoverian sovereigns, they appeared to have equally little cause for thankfulness to the colonial authorities of the past and the present. Under British rule they knew at least where they stood; under a new regime their future was clouded in uncertainty. In view of the past and the likelihood of what the future would bring, Catholics faced a dilemma on either horn of which they might be impaled. One might hazard the prediction that their respect for authority would outweigh other considerations and bring them into the Tory camp. At all events, under the circumstances it is not surprising that there were Catholic Tories; rather it is amazing that they were not more numerous.

Even today a certain degree of odium attaches to the appellation Tory, so that one would prefer that those of his creed or racial stock were free of the taint. Despite the inherent improbability that all who profess a certain faith or belong to a certain race should ever be of one mind on a political issue, such extreme claims have been made by overzealous persons unduly eager to glorify a particular creed or race. Such assumptions conflict with human nature, which shrinks from such regimentation. Besides, it is human to err, and to err in good faith. After all, the question which course one should follow was one on which men could differ and differ honestly without deserving the imputation of being wicked. Many a man might have concurred with the Quaker Samuel Curwen that there was room for difference of opinion as to what constituted political orthodoxy, and that acceptance by a majority did not necessarily convince the minority that the course was proper or that they must follow suit. Of themselves mere numbers were no decisive factor in determining a man's conscience or convictions.

An instance of indiscreet effort to exalt a race, and by indirection a creed, is James M'Clune's boast that in the struggle for independence "no one whose ancestry could be traced to Scotland or the North of Ireland was found among the adherents of royalty."[2] No less bold was John Gilmary Shea, who would clear all Catholics from the least taint of lukewarmness or lack of patriotism. Shea smarted under the taunt of Bancroft, who deplored the fact that, whereas Washington found it impossible to enlist recruits in adequate numbers, Howe "formed a regiment of Roman Catholics," while Clinton with "still better results coveted the Irish," and Lord Rawdon raised a regiment "in which officers and men were exclusively Irish" with "nearly five hundred deserters from the American army" in its ranks.[3] This was a serious indictment. If true, it convicts the Irish, and Catholics in general, of widespread Toryism and of disaffection on a big scale.

---

[2] James M'Clune, *The History of the Presbyterian Church in the Forks of the Brandywine, Chester Co. Pa., 1735-1885*, p. 19. Philadelphia, 1885. This same extreme claim has been advanced by more recent writers.

[3] George Bancroft, *History of the United States*, Vol. 10, p. 175. 10 vols. Boston, 1874.

Shea had previously disposed of this arraignment by a categorical denial. "There were no Tories, no falterers and final deserters among them; none to shout for Congress, while they carried a British protection for emergencies. The Catholics were to a man, with their clergy, staunch and true, which can be said of none of the sects; for the Methodists, following the course of their founder, Wesley, were all on the Tory side, and nearly every denomination was divided. Catholics bore their part bravely; and stood by the cause sturdily when men like Arnold made their Protestantism a pretext for deserting the cause."[4] Shea wrote this sweeping claim for Catholics and condemnation of all Protestant denominations in 1876, centennial of the Declaration of Independence. Far from retracting his generalization, Shea emphatically reiterated his claim nine years later, the year of the appearance of the first volume of the New York edition of Bancroft's history. "Catholics spontaneously, universally and energetically gave their adhesion to the cause of America, and, when the time came, to American independence. There was no faltering, no division. Every Catholic in the land was a Whig. In the lists of Tories and Loyalists, in the volumes since written about them, you cannot find the name of a single Catholic. There were no Catholic Tories."[5]

This is indeed forthright language, but *a priori* it is most unlikely that Catholics according to Shea, or Presbyterians according to M'Clune, or any other group whatsoever would, to a man, be found in the patriot camp. Did either or both of these historians succumb to emotion and indulge in overstatement to prove a point, to clear his coreligionists? That Shea should have been unaware that there were Catholic Tories, and Catholic Tories in British military service, taxes credulity. In General Clinton's headquarters papers in the William Clements Library we have the official correspondence and reports on all British regular and volunteer or provincial regiments in America. They prove that there were Catholic Tories, but to what extent and how effectively they aided the British, and how many of them were actually deserters from the American forces, is difficult if not impossible to establish.

---

[4] John Gilmary Shea, "The Catholic Church in American History," *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, Chap. 1, p. 154, January 1876.

[5] John Gilmary Shea, "Catholics and Catholicity in the Days of the American Revolution," *Proceedings of the First Meeting Held by the United States Catholic Historical Society at the University Club Theatre, New York City, Thursday, May 10, 1885*, p. 20. New York, 1885.

In a political crisis men react differently to the challenge. Some become so reticent as effectually to conceal their true sentiments; others are bold and tireless in expressing their approval or opposition. It may well be that an individual Catholic gave no clue to his secret sympathy with Tories, or that his assistance was clandestine, or again that he may have been a mere cipher so lacking in influence that the local patriot authorities did not disturb or arraign him. Moreover, court records may have perished. Depending on a variety of circumstances too difficult to evaluate, an individual may wield or lack influence. For this reason we feel justified in restricting our study to groups rather than to individuals, for groups bespeak a wider range of a particular sentiment. A single group of Catholic Tories would outweigh many individuals in significance. Actually there were two groups of Catholic Tories whose activities in behalf of England disprove Shea's proud boast. Their careers can be traced in British army records in the Sir Henry Clinton and Frederick Mackenzie papers.

When hostilities began British authorities at home and in America were staunchly opposed to the enlistment of Catholics. In this they were guided by traditional distrust and fear of Catholics. A break with tradition came with the recruiting of Catholics in Connaught and Munster, and the same policy was suggested for America; but the proposal met the sharp opposition of General Howe, whose utter contempt for Irish Catholics was poured out in a letter to Lord Dartmouth.[6] Opposition crumbled, however, when victory over the rebellious colonies eluded the grasp of British generals. The events of 1777, the straits in which the British found themselves, and rumors of an impending alliance between France and America opened the eyes of British officialdom to the feasibility of recruiting Roman Catholics in America as the solution to the pressing problem of man power. Why, then, should not British policy at home be introduced in America? In vindication of his conduct as commander-in-chief Howe later claimed that, after Philadelphia's capture, he held out "greater encouragement" to several local citizens, among them Mr. Clifton, "the chief of the Roman Catholic persuasion, of whom there were said to be many in Philadelphia, as well as in the rebel army serving against their inclinations."[7] Stephen Moylan and his men would have fumed at this slur on their patriotic ardor. At all events, in pursuance of this plan of utilizing Roman Catholics, Howe in October or November approved the cadre of officers of the Roman Catholic Volunteers submitted by Alfred Clifton.[8]

Other contemporary enemy sources confirm the origin of this regiment. Captain-Major John Montresor, chief engineer of the British forces, noted in his journal on November 15: "Three Regiments of Provincials raising, vzt. Allen's Chalmer's and Clifton's. The latter Roman Catholics."[9] And in the following spring Captain Johann Heinrichs of the Hessian Jaeger Corps informed his brother that during the winter "we have organized two regiments of foot, one of which is wholly made up of Roman Catholicks."[10] Patriots were in touch with what transpired in Philadelphia. Reverend Henry Muhlenberg confided to his journal his low opinion of these British auxiliaries and the threat they were because of their low moral character, evil propensities, and knowledge of the country; but his judgment was not based on direct contact with those he denounced.[11]

---

[6] "But this army tho' complete in the Spring, must have between 6 and 7000 Recruits, and the worst Kind if chiefly composed of Irish Catholics, certain to desert if put to hard work, and from their Ignorance of Arms, not entitled to the smallest confidence as Soldiers" (Howe to Dartmouth, November 26, 1775, quoted by E. E. Curtis, *The Organization of the British Army in the American Revolution*, p. 52. [New Haven, 1926]).

[7] *The Narrative of Lieut. Gen. William Howe, in a Committee of the House of Commons, on the 29th of April 1779, Relative to His Conduct during His Late Command of the King's Troops in North America, to Which Are Added Some Observations upon a Pamphlet Entitled Letters to a Nobleman*, p. 53. London, 1780.

[8] Siebert, *Loyalists*, p. 41. Alfred was his name. Sabine calls him Arthur, and Griffin both Alfred and Arthur.

Alfred Clifton, "a gentleman of the Catholic faith" and "a prominent member of his religious community" according to Sabine, lived on "Second between Mulberry and Sassafras at corner of Clifton Alley."[12] Griffin adds that his name appears on the baptism and marriage register of old St. Joseph's Church[13] in Philadelphia. The first muster of the Roman Catholic Volunteers took place on December 14 with a scant 62 men present, but a vigorous recruiting campaign swelled the number to 176 in ten days.[14] Griffin lists the officers as follows: Lieutenant Colonel Alfred Clifton, Major John Lynch, Captains Keneth McCulloch, Mathias Hanley, Martin McEvoy, Nicholas Wuregan, John McKinnon; Lieutenants Peter Eck, John Connell, Edward Holland, James Hanrahan, Ebenezer Wilson, John O'Neill; Ensigns John Grashune, Arthur Bailie, Thomas Quinn,

---

[9] "Montresor Journals," p. 476.

[10] "Extracts from the Letter Book of Captain Johann Heinrichs of the Hessian Jaeger Corps, 1778-1780."

[11] "Extracts from Journal of Reverend Dr. [Henry M.] Muhlenberg, 1776-1777." *Collections of Pennsylvania Historical Society*, Vol. I, p. 180. Philadelphia, 1853. "One regiment of Catholics, one of negroes, who are fit and ready for any barbarities, have no feelings of humanity, and know every corner of the country."

[12] Griffin,*Catholics*, Vol. 1, pp. 328, 330.

[13] *Ibid.*, Vol. 1, p. 331.

[14] Siebert, *Loyalists*, p. 41.

Edward Gadwin; Chaplain Frederick Farmer; Quartermaster John Holland.[15]

The designation of Frederick Farmer as chaplain was erroneous on two counts. In the first place his name was Ferdinand; secondly, proof that he accepted the chaplaincy is lacking. In a letter on March 2, 1778, he writes to another priest that when he "waited upon" General Howe after his capture of the city, Howe had broached the idea of a regiment of Roman Catholics. Father Farmer adds that Mr. Clifton, "an English gentleman of an Irish mother," commands the contingent with rank of lieutenant colonel. "They desire me to be their chaplain which embarasseth me on account of my age and several other reasons."[16] As pastor of a church in Philadelphia, Father Farmer may have administered the sacraments to Clifton's men, but there exists no proof of his serving in the capacity of official chaplain. No British army records list him in that role. In the tabulation of officers invariably there is a blank space after "chaplain of regiment." Moreover, the civic honors conferred on Father Farmer after the evacuation of the city by Howe is an irrefragable argument that his connection with this Tory regiment was purely religious in character and in the role of pastor, not official in any sense.

Meager indeed is the information on the Roman Catholic Volunteers to be gleaned from British army records. Almost at once the regiment experienced the effects of hasty and indiscriminate recruiting. The loyalty of some, if it even existed, was shortlived. As early as January 1778,[17] Samuel Green, Ralph Faraby, and Thomas Riley, "private soldiers in the Provincial Regt of Foot, call'd the Roman Catholic Volunteers," were tried by court-martial for advising John Bennet to "Desert to the Rebels with his Arms, Accoutrements, etc." The court adjudged Green guilty and sentenced him to "Receive One Thousand Lashes by the Drummers of the Garrison then to be Drum^{d} out," but it acquitted Faraby and Riley. In April another court cleared William Smith of "attempting to cross the Schuylkill with Intent to Desert to the Rebels."[18] In May, Patrick Mullen was found guilty of attempting desertion, and sentenced to the customary one thousand lashes, a verdict approved by Howe, who ordered its execution at the discretion of the commanding officer.[19] To all appearances disaffection was rife; loyalty was wearing very thin. Some minor and noncombatant assignments were given to the Roman Catholic Volunteers, as when they were ordered to assist the fifty-fifth and sixty-third regiments in protecting the woodcutters at work on the bank of the river.[20] The plain truth is that the Volunteers did not prosper, despite Howe's personal encouragement and sanguine expectation. Enthusiasm had evaporated after an initial outburst. This Howe admitted when he relinquished command to his successor, General Henry Clinton. Clifton's group numbered a mere 180, and it lacked unity and esprit de corps.

---

[15] Griffin, *Catholics*, Vol. 1, p. 328.

[16] *Woodstock Letters*, Vol. 14, p. 196. Letter of Farmer, March 2, 1778.

[17] Orderly Book of General Howe, March 9, 1776—May 1, 1778, January, 1778. Manuscript in William Clements Library.

Clinton was not long in deciding to abandon Philadelphia as a liability, return to New York, and conduct operations from that strategic base. This he effected by an overland march through New Jersey in which the Roman Catholic Volunteers were deputed to escort the heavy artillery and baggage. Secure at last in New York, Clinton launched an intensive campaign to bring this unit to full complement. Advertisements in the newspapers held out inducements to recruits;[21] stations were set up to facilitate induction.[22] On the whole this effort bore fruit, for by August the muster roll revealed a strength of 331,[23] a remarkable increase over the 180 of the previous May. The Roman Catholic Volunteers had attained the zenith of their career.

---

[18] Stephen Kemble, *The Kemble Papers, Collections of the New York Historical Society for 1883*, Vol. 1, p. 566. New York, 1884.

[19] *Ibid.*, Vol. 1, p. 582.

[20] "Montresor Journals," p. 489.

[21] *New York Gazette and Weekly Mercury,* July 13 and 20, 1778.

Even so, all was not well. A deep-seated malady threatened the very life of the organization. Apparently discipline had always been lax, and the retreat from Philadelphia to New York had been marked by excesses which were the fruit of this laxity. Worst of all, officers were implicated; they had connived at the misdeeds of subordinates; they had indulged in practices forbidden by the rules of war. Now inaction gave occasion for new breaches of discipline and disregard of military decorum. The nadir was reached; and Clinton, vexed and angry, determined on drastic action.

On October 24, headquarters disclosed to the army that a general court-martial,[24] presided over by Lieutenant Colonel Ludlow, had found Captain McKinnon of the Roman Catholic Volunteers guilty of "ungentleman Like behaviour," to wit, "Plundering in the Jerseys," and "suffering himself to be Kick^{d} by Capt. M'Evoy of the same corps on a Parade without properly resenting it," and therefore sentenced him to be cashiered from his majesty's service. In addition, the same court held that Captain M'Evoy of the same regiment was guilty of plundering "in taking a horse and cows," and that he had behaved "indecently on the Parade" by a display of open contempt for a fellow officer, and he too was discharged in disgrace. Both judgments were approved by Clinton.[25] This summary dismissal of two captains indicates the decay and collapse of esprit de corps. With this court-martial the Roman Catholic Volunteers all but vanish from the pages of history. A remarkable decline in numbers ensued. A few inconsequential references to them may be found scattered in the army records, but Clinton resolved to amputate this diseased member lest it infect the whole body. A report by Clinton to Lord George Germain, secretary of state for the colonies, states that the collapse of discipline had induced him to transfer eighty men from the Roman Catholic Volunteers to the Volunteers of Ireland and abolish the former group.[26] What an anticlimax to Clifton's high hopes in August! Thus the Roman Catholic Volunteers came to an untimely and dishonored end. Its demise stirred no comment in official or other circles; its grave was unmarked. This disgraceful ending highlights the magnitude of Howe's failure. It also reveals how Bancroft exaggerated and misled the reader when he said that Howe formed a regiment of Roman Catholics in Philadelphia.

---

[22] N. Phelps Stokes, *Iconography of Manhattan Island,* Vol. 5, p. 1070. 6 vols. New York, 1915-1928.

[23] Siebert, *Loyalists,* p. 54.

[24] Robert Clayton, Captain Robert Clayton's Orderly Book, 1777-1778. Manuscript in Pennsylvania Historical Society Library.

[25] *Ibid.*

In a sense Bancroft's contention involves a question of nomenclature. In name Clifton's group of 180 men when Howe was replaced by Clinton as British commander in Philadelphia was a regiment in process of formation, but in a military sense it was still very far from being an actual regiment. Above all the 80 men, the remnant of the Roman Catholic Volunteers incorporated into the Volunteers of Ireland, could in no true sense be classified as a regiment. Bancroft's lack of precision in the use of a term with fixed meaning is bound to mislead the reader and create a false impression.

Likewise the ending of the Roman Catholic Volunteers equally confutes Shea's boast that to a man Catholics were Whigs, that not one was a Tory. Guilday, who is more cautious, contends that Griffin was unable to discover a Catholic of important social or financial standing who sided with Great Britain in the struggle.[27] This is a serious qualifying of Griffin's sweeping denial, and it implies a rather arbitrary standard of social and financial prominence. If the characterization of Clifton by Howe and Father Farmer have meaning, he was not a social nobody in his community; and we must bear in mind that Clifton was personally acquainted with Howe and Farmer.

---

[26] *Sackville-Germain Papers,* Sir Henry Clinton to Lord George Germain, October 23, 1778. William Clements Library.

Clifton's Tory activities aroused the wrath of patriot authorities in Pennsylvania, and retribution was prompt. In mid-May 1778 the Supreme Executive Council of the Commonwealth issued a proclamation that, because he "adhered to and knowingly and willingly aided and assisted the enemies of this State, and of the United States of America," by joining their armies at Philadelphia, Clifton was guilty of high treason.[28] A little more than two years later the Tory *New York Gazette and Weekly Mercury* announced the death in that city of this unhappy man. Scion of an "ancient British family," according to the obituary, he had given many years to the service of "his Prussian Majesty, and the Empress of Russia." These antecedents may account for his attachment to England rather than to the state of Pennsylvania, his new home. The egregious fiasco of his efforts in behalf of his mother country may well have crushed his spirit. In announcing his death on February 27, 1783, the *Town and Country Magazine* designated him William Clifton, Esq. of Tower Hill, recently of the Loyalists of Philadelphia.

Of far sterner stuff were the Volunteers of Ireland, into which the remnant of the Roman Catholic volunteers was embodied by General Clinton. While this accretion did not constitute the Volunteers of Ireland a body exclusively or chiefly Catholic in membership, it obliges us to trace its career. Moreover, there were Catholics in this unit before Clinton abolished the Roman Catholic Volunteers .

---

[27] Guilday, *John Carroll*, p. 81.

[28] *Pennsylvania Packet*, May 13, 1778.

The Volunteers of Ireland were the joint project of General Henry Clinton and Lord Rawdon. Lieutenant Colonel Stephen Kemble noted in his journal at the beginning of May 1778: "Lord Rawdon and Captain Sutherland raising Provincial Battalions, the latter a Caledonian, the former a Hibernian, both have their views."[29] From this we infer that Rawdon began to organize in Philadelphia during the British occupation of the city. By May he had made such progress that Clinton designated him commander of the corps,[30] with rank of colonel. Other officers were also assigned, men drawn from regiments of the British army.

The genesis, *raison d'etre*, and unique character of this volunteer regiment are set forth in a lengthy, rambling communication of Sir Henry Clinton to Lord Germain, dated New York, October 23, 1778.[31] Clinton argued that England's chief antagonists in America were Irish immigrants who, because of their number and clannishness, were never fully assimilated by Americans. To lure them from the enemy he had created a regiment "entirely Irish" in officers and men; he had patronized the regiment with the result that "above 300 deserters" had been inducted and armed. To his own very favorable opinion of the spirit and discipline of the unit Clinton added that of Cornwallis in corroboration. As a volunteer regiment the men had been outfitted at the expense of the officers, drawn largely from the regular army and promoted one rank only. He appended a list of these officers,[32] and requested that the Volunteers be "established" because of the peculiar character of the rank and file. Clinton went on to suggest that an effective incentive to enlistment would be the assurance of royal pardon for all crimes committed in Ireland, murder alone excepted. Germain's reply was in part a grant, in part a denial of Clinton's proposal. Generous allotment of public lands to officers and men was approved and additional bounties were sanctioned, but legal obstacles prevented a general condonation of crimes. However, Germain outlined a method of procedure that would comply with the law and, for the most part, satisfy the desires and requests of Lord Rawdon.

---

[29] Kemble, *Kemble Papers*, p. 150.

[30] *Ibid.*, p. 586.

[31] B. F. Stevens, *Facsimiles of Manuscripts in European Archives Relating to America, 1773-1783.* No. 1190. London, 1892.

[32] Colonel Lord Rawdon; Lt. Col., Wellborne Ellis Doyle; Major, John Despard; Captains, John Campbell, John Doyle, James King, William Barry; Capt. Lt., David Dalton; Lieutenants, Charles Vallancey, Charles Bingham, Edward Fitzgerald, James Moffat, Thomas Proctor, Samuel Bradstreet, William Gillespie, Herman Black; Ensigns, John Jewell, John Stuart, Thomas Wilson,

Meanwhile Clinton intervened in the cutthroat competition between the several provincial corps for recruits by ordaining that none was "to entertain Irish recruits except the Queen's Rangers, the Roman Catholic Volunteers and the Volunteers of Ireland."[33] This program met with some success, inasmuch as Siebert[34] assures us that by the fall of 1779 the Volunteers of Ireland numbered 509; but this figure is slightly in excess of the official tabulation for March.[35] At first the Volunteers saw only light service such as the covering of foraging parties. Despite Clinton's high praise of their discipline there were trials and convictions for attempted desertion, and the German auxiliaries preferred charges of assault and highway robbery, even of murder.[36] St. Patrick's Day was observed with additional zest, the Volunteers impressing the spectators by their physique and

---

Edward Gilborne, Thomas Flynn, David Whitley, Joseph Thompson, John Cunningham, Thomas Serjeant; Adjutant, John Jewell; Quartermaster, John Stewart; Surgeon, George Armstrong; Surgeon's-mate, John Hill. *Sackville-Germain Papers*, Sir Henry Clinton to Lord George Germain, October 23, 1778.

[33] Kemble, *Kemble Papers*, p. 588.

[34] Siebert, *Loyalists*, p. 53.

[35] *The Henry Clinton Papers*, March, 1779. Return of Women, Children and Waggoners of the British Regiments, New Levies and Civil Department Victualed at New York and its Dependencies from 18 to 24 March 1779. Volunteers of Ireland 494 men, 89 women, 38 children, 4 waggoners.

[36] *Ibid.* Weekly State of the provost at New York, June 19, 1780; June 30, 1780.

bearing.[37] The advertising campaign continued;[38] new recruits were inducted; numbers fluctuated, but they remained well above 400, at times nearing 500. Washington's intelligence network discovered that the Volunteers were under orders to embark,[39] and it was surmised that Charleston, South Carolina, was their destination, a conjecture that eventually proved correct. Renewed efforts to have the officers "regularized" met with success in January 1780.[40] The whereabouts of the regiment is somewhat uncertain, but it seems to have been aboard ship awaiting orders to sail, their scene of future operations still undecided, at least undisclosed.

At this juncture Rawdon sensed a threat to the continuance of the Volunteers as a unit; he suspected a plot to divide his men, and that would jeopardize his command; he fought against sending a detachment of his soldiers "elsewhere under another commander."[41] Such procedure, he argued, would wreck his company, defeat the very purpose of its formation. When Clinton rescinded the order Rawdon breathed freely. In exuberance of spirit he toyed with the idea of raising a second group; and to forestall a recurrence of the recent unpleasant situation, and because it would entail great personal expense, he made bold to lay down restrictions as to its employment. These dreams were quickly dissipated by Clinton, who could brook no such infringement on his freedom of action as commander-in-chief; in very forthright language he informed Rawdon to this effect. To Rawdon the soldier the reasonableness of Clinton's stand was apparent. He assented, withdrew his demands, and dropped the idea of a second battalion. Henceforth he would bend every effort to make his original command a first-rate combat unit according to plan.

---

[37] Frank Moore. *Diary of the American Revolution*, Vol. 2, p. 151. 2 vols. New York, 1860. ". . . marched four hundred strapping fellows, neither influenced by Yankee or Ague."

[38] *Royal Gazette*, February 3, 6, 10, 13, 17, 20, 24, 27; March 3, 6, 10, 13, 17, 20, 24, 27, 31; April 3, 7, 10, 14, 17, 21, 24, 28, 1779.

[39] Fitzpatrick, *George Washington*, Vol. 16, p. 333.

[40] Germain to Clinton, January 19, 1780.

[41] Rawdon to Major Andre, December 7, 1779. *Clinton Papers*.

Were the Volunteers embarked late in 1779 or early in 1780? On the one hand provisions to the value of six pounds, fourteen shillings, two pence were issued to them in Charleston, South Carolina, between February 24 and April 24;[42] on the other on St. Patrick's Day, Rawdon gave his men, quartered at Jamaica, "a munificent entertainment" featured by the singing of Barney Thompson, the piper of the regiment.[43] At any rate, the security of New York was to give way to the perils of southern battlefields. On March 25 Frederick Mackenzie, deputy adjutant general, listed the Volunteers of Ireland with other provincial regiments, and the Regiment de Dittfurth, as scheduled for embarkation.[44] As the Volunteers were 512 strong, they were assigned to three ships, the *Springfield* (319 tons), the *Houston* (258 tons), and the *Selina* (231 tons), all to be identified by a "White vane and a Red Ball Main." Under Major General Matthew the flotilla quitted New York, its destination still very much a mystery.[45]

The precise dates of departure from New York and of arrival in Charleston are shrouded in ambiguity, but hardly had Rawdon's men set foot on Carolina soil when Cornwallis pressed them into active service.[46] The abrupt transition from the inactivity of barracks life in New York to active duty in South Carolina may have been too sudden for some individuals. By April 30 James Salmon, Willie Neile, and David Vance were in the provost's camp in Charleston following their capture after deserting and joining the American army;[47] and by mid-May "Ja. Jones, Jno. Butler, Jno. Beckham and Jo. Fenerty" were in the same dire straits,[48] while the gaol in New York held John Black, a deserter, William Parks, awaiting trial for robbery, and Thomas Kelly, under sentence of death for assaulting and robbing Sergeant Notzer of the Hessian Grenadiers.[49] The voyage and change of climate affected the health of a number, but in general the regiment was in excellent physical condition, as is attested by official returns for May 15, when with rank and file of 537 it exceeded all of the other provincial regiments operating in South Carolina and Georgia.[50]

---

[42] *Clinton Papers*, Abstract of the amount of provisions issued . . .

[43] Moore, *Diary*, Vol. 2, p. 261, quoting *Rivington's Gazette*, March 18, 1780.

[44] *Clinton Papers*, Embarkation return of the following corps, New York, March 25, 1780.

[45] Kemble, *Kemble Papers*, p. 177.

[46] *Clinton Papers*. Cornwallis to Clinton, April 24, 1780.

Before the regiment became fully acclimated tension developed over the double commissions of some officers, with one rank in the Line and another in the Volunteers. When London ordered the discontinuance of double commissions Rawdon faced a difficult choice. In a letter to Andre[51] he unfolded his case. He rehearsed the story of the origin and purpose of the Volunteers; he denied that personal advantage accrued to himself; he insisted that the spirit and equipment of the regiment were due to his liberality in pouring out funds and to his undivided attention. Had not Clinton himself conceived the idea of raising such a body? Had he not urged it on Rawdon and authorized him to proceed in its formation? Was it not approved by Germain? After years of anxiety and care, now, of a sudden, he is asked to dissociate himself from the men who look to him for leadership, or else sever connection with the service on which all of his hopes had centered. As the regiment "raised upon my faith" was attached to him, he could only resign his lieutenant colonelcy in the Line, even though this alternative was tantamount to being "divorced forever from my country."

---

[47] *Ibid.* Report of prisoners in the Provost's camp of Charleston, April 30, 1780.

[48] *Ibid.*, May 21, 1780.

[49] *Ibid.* Weekly state of the Provost at New York, June 19, 1780; June 30, 1780.

[50] *Ibid.* State of the Troops under the Command of Lt. Gen. Rt. Honorable Charles Earl Cornwallis, May 15, 1780.

[51] *Ibid.* Rawdon to Andre, May 21, 1780.

Moved by this stirring appeal, Clinton interposed in Rawdon's behalf and intervened with Germain.[52] According to Clinton, Rawdon had resigned his commission in the army, but his noteworthy service and the expense he incurred in building up the Volunteers, who regarded him as a father, entitled him to special consideration. Would his majesty, in the interest of the army and to save an efficient body of troops from disintegration, reinstate Rawdon in the rank he had relinquished? The intervention of Clinton brought results, for Germain replied[53] that Rawdon's case was indeed special and that the general regulation respecting double commissions was not to apply to him. Clinton should notify Rawdon immediately of the restoration of his rank in the army, and that he was likewise to retain command of the Volunteers of Ireland.

With one crisis happily surmounted, another no less vexatious arose to plague Rawdon. The policy inaugurated by Clinton and put into execution by Rawdon now began to pay unexpected dividends. It will be recalled that, in his awareness of the great number of desertions at Valley Forge, Clinton resolved to capitalize on the situation by offering inducements to these unhappy men to enter British service. When, in his own words to Germain, some three hundred had been rounded up he conceived the idea of an exclusively Irish regiment, and so the Volunteers of Ireland had come into being. In all this the British commander-in-chief overlooked the fact that desperate circumstances, not change of heart or attachment to Britain, had impelled these men to enlist under the British flag; they had resorted to it only as an avenue of escape from extreme wretchedness and dire need. Rawdon too failed to realize that their loyalty was not built on solid foundation, that many were not eager to sacrifice life or limb for a British king, and that if occasion offered some of them would desert again without a qualm of conscience. Even while the Volunteers were in New York, Edward Warren, a drummer, had deserted, served on a rebel privateer, been captured, and been executed.[54] This should have served as a warning to Clinton and Rawdon but it did not; so out of touch with reality were they.

---

[52] *Ibid.* Clinton to Germain, June 3, 1780.

[53] *Ibid.* Germain to Clinton, July 4, 1780.

Scarcely had the Volunteers set foot on South Carolina soil when others took french leave, sometimes with the like unhappy consequences to themselves. Clinton and Rawdon knew that in the uplands beyond Charleston there were many small Irish communities, and they hoped to draw recruits to the Volunteers from this source. But their plan boomeranged. As Rawdon moved inland from Charleston into these Irish settlements, desertions multiplied. A contemporary puts his loss at "about half his effectives,"[55] but the official returns in the Clinton Papers refute this estimate. At any rate, desertions grew so numerous that Rawdon concluded that defection was fostered and abetted by the inhabitants, who did not scruple to offer asylum and protection to runaways. If the trend were not checked, his force might crumble. Moreover, these frontier settlers, even those on parole, readily joined the forces of Sumter and other American guerrilla leaders.[56] Beside himself with rage, Rawdon notified a certain

---

[54] *Ibid.* List of executions . . . May 6, 1782.

[55] Michael J. O'Brien, *A Hidden Phase of the American Revolution*, p. 193. New York. 1920. "In the summer of 1781 Lord Rawdon . . . took his Volunteers from Camden to the Savanah River, and on the march as they passed through the Irish settlements in the Chester and Newbury districts where he lost more than half of his effectives through desertion. This incident is referred to by Joseph James, a Virginia member of the Continental Congress in a letter to George Washington on August 6, 1781 in which he said: 'Rawdon's troops had been reduced about half by the march to Ninety-Six.' "

[56] Banastre Tarleton, *History of the Campaigns of 1780 and 1781*, p. 119. Dublin, 1787. Extract of Letter from Lieutenant General Cornwallis to Sir Henry Clinton.

Major Rugely[57] that the complicity of the inhabitants in the matter was obvious. Drastic measures were in order with people so dead to all sense of loyalty to their sovereign. Hence whipping, incarceration, or deportation to the West Indies would be the lot of those who harbored deserters or collaborated with them in any way. As for the deserters themselves, "I will give the inhabitants ten guineas for the head of any deserter belonging to the Volunteers; and five guineas only if they bring him in alive. They shall likewise be rewarded though not for that amount for such deserters as they may secure belonging to any other regiment." This insane directive, shocking in its implication, is a curious footnote to Clinton's characterization of Rawdon's relationship to his men as fatherly and their regard for him as filial.

Although this savage directive respecting deserters horrifies us, it appears to have been in accord with usual British army practice. At any rate, under date of Fort Edward, 6th August, 1777, we read in the Orderly Book of Burgoyne's Army: "It is positively Ordered that a report of absent men be sent to head Quarters within an hour after each roll Calling, in order that partys of savages may be immediately dispatched in pursuit of them who have Orders to scalp all deserters." As usual, such excessive severity tended to defeat the very purpose for which it was resorted to: desertion was far from uncommon in the British forces in America, and it was rampant among the German mercenaries when they happened to be in a district peopled by German-speaking colonists.

Moreover, such inhuman expedients were peculiarly ineffective in an area in which disaffection was endemic; they were no solution of a pressing problem; actually such dire threats tended to promote and justify the conduct of the people of the area. And besides, they trampled on their rights and were in open conflict with the acknowledged rules regulating warfare among civilized peoples. Obviously, too, instead of serving as an incentive to enlistment, they killed all prospects of securing recruits to counterbalance losses through desertion or disease.

---

[57] Cecil B. Hartley, *Heroes and Patriots of the South*, pp. 130-32. Philadelphia, 1860. Rawdon to Rugely, July 1, 1780.

When Rawdon's supreme folly came to the ears of Washington, he protested most vigorously to Clinton, who in turn inquired of Cornwallis whether Rawdon's letter to Rugely was genuine or a forgery contrived by the enemy to discredit a British officer.[58] Rawdon was called on to explain his threat to have recourse to measures not sanctioned by the customary practice of civilized nations. In his reply[59] to his superior he did not disavow his manifesto, but he tried to justify himself on the score that when the Volunteers were at Waxhaw the camp was frequented by men who were in constant communication with the enemy at Charlottesburg, used "every artifice to debauch the minds of my soldiers," and aided them in deserting. A return to Camden did not mend matters. The people of Waxhaw openly renounced their allegiance to the king. Completely disillusioned as to the temper of the people, surrounded as he was by enemies, with his hopes of recruits shattered, his force somewhat reduced by illness, and the troops in a bad mood because of the climate and the restraints imposed on them, he had resorted to the threat of deportation as a measure of self-preservation warranted by the circumstances. Silence cloaked his promise of double reward for the head of a deserter, for this was a matter of internal military discipline beyond Washington's jurisdiction.

An event more to the credit of Rawdon and his men was the battle of Camden on August 16 when they underwent their first real baptism of fire. Rawdon led the left wing in the encounter and was lauded by Cornwallis[60] for "distinguished courage and ability." The encomium was well deserved, and it applied also to the regiment, for the Volunteers lost seventeen privates killed and sixty-four wounded, while Lieutenant Gillespie, Ensigns Whatley and Thompson, two sergeants, and one drummer were wounded. The fact that, whereas total British casualties numbered 324, no less than 84 were Rawdon's men testified at once to his success in whipping them into an efficient combat unit and to their steadfastness under fire. Rawdon and his men could feel elated over their combat record, but regimental harmony was dealt a blow by a petty but bitter feud between Lieutenant Colonel Wellburne Ellis Doyle and Captain William Barry which did credit to neither. About this time, too, Rawdon unearthed evidence that the Volunteers had been defrauded of 4,000 pounds sterling by a certain Thomas Blockly in New York.

---

[58] *Clinton Papers*, Clinton to Cornwallis, November 5, 1780.

[59] *Ibid.* Rawdon to Cornwallis, December 5, 1780.

[60] *Ibid.* Cornwallis to Germain, August 20, 1780.

When Cornwallis fell victim to fever Rawdon attended to official correspondence and informed Clinton at headquarters in New York[61] that the situation was deteriorating so rapidly that the future was ominous; the commander was ill, fever ravaged the ranks, uprisings beyond the British lines were epidemic, Major Ferguson had met death in defeat, the terrain was unknown to the British, enemy cavalry was alert and bold, the guerrilla warfare resorted to by the enemy put the British at a disadvantage, communications were in jeopardy, concerted action by Cornwallis and Leslie would be difficult.

With the situation already so perilous Cornwallis split his forces by setting out for Wilmington on the coast, while Rawdon was left in command of the troops in and around Camden. This maneuver or strategy, if such it should be called, invited disaster. The climax was reached when the appointment of General Nathaniel Greene to replace Gates as commander of American forces in the south presaged relentless enemy pressure, for Greene was brave, wily, and resourceful.

---

[61] *Ibid.* Rawdon to Clinton, October 29, 1780.

Greene and Rawdon clashed on April 25 at Hobkirk's Hill, which history classifies as a Pyrrhic British victory. Of the Volunteers, Lieutenant Jewell, a sergeant, and eleven privates were killed; Major Campbell, Lieutenants Moffatt and Black, two ensigns, five sergeants, and sixty-five privates wounded, a drummer and sixteen privates missing; a total of 105 casualties for the Volunteers of Ireland in a total British loss of 251. The Volunteers bore the brunt of the fighting and of the losses. Greene, it is true, suffered a setback, but his army was not destroyed; he could bide his time and attack again when conditions were favorable, but replacements for Rawdon were impossible in an area swarming with guerrillas, and far from his coastal base. And Cornwallis, instead of hastening to his rescue, did no more than assure Clinton[62] that Rawdon's "great abilities, Courage and firmness of mind cannot be sufficiently admired and applauded." In headquarters in New York, Rawdon's partial and costly success was interpreted as "important advantages over the Rebels." His conduct won due recognition, but no one seems to have sensed the gravity of the situation in faraway Carolina. Commendation was indeed a poor substitute for reinforcements.

Exhausted by his efforts at Hobkirk's Hill, Rawdon succumbed to fatigue and fever. A very sick man, he applied to Clinton for leave to return to Europe because of ill health. Since the whole Carolina campaign threatened to collapse if he relinquished command, Clinton, while replying favorably, counseled delay so long as his health permitted. As an inducement to remain Clinton commissioned him brigadier general. With many of his Volunteers at posts deep in the forests and swamps of South Carolina, Rawdon deferred his departure in the hope of extricating them, but his physical condition would not brook longer delay. On August 31, 1781, he took leave of America while controversy raged over his treatment of prisoners, climaxed by the hanging of a certain Colonel Haynes of the militia. Within a week Rawdon himself was a prisoner, captured by the French on the high sea.[63]

---

[62] *Ibid.* Cornwallis to Clinton, May 20, 1781.

Under Major General Gould, successor to Rawdon, on September 8, 1781, the Volunteers of Ireland were involved at Eutaw Springs in their last engagement. No details of their role have been found in official correspondence. Eutaw Springs terminated active service; the journey's end was reached. Cornwallis' defeat and surrender at Yorktown in October left them stranded in Charleston and elsewhere in South Carolina. They had fought bravely and well, but their cause had collapsed in utter defeat. A lost cause might evoke stirring memories; it might be a sort of balm to wounds suffered in its behalf, but it would be a doubtful prop to discipline or military élan. The morale of the British troops in Charleston in the face of a dark future, and the corrosion that accompanies inaction set in; desertions multiplied. By February 15, 1782, the Volunteers dwindled to 182 fit for duty in a total of 340 effectives.[64]

Now that we have traced the career of the two groups in which Catholic Tories served under the British flag, we ask how numerous were Tories in Pennsylvania and Philadelphia, how many entered British service, how many Catholics did so? Our curiosity must be satisfied with qualified and hesitant answers to these intriguing questions. When the British were still in Philadelphia but the evacuation of the city was impending, Captain Johann Heinrichs[65] estimated that there were approximately a thousand families in the city so staunch in their loyalty to Britain that they were prepared to "leave hearth and home" and accompany the army with whatever possessions they could carry or have transported. Obviously this may have been the overestimate of a foreigner; at any rate it was a personal estimate, not an official report. After a thorough study of Loyalism in Pennsylvania, Siebert concluded[66] that enlistments in the British forces may have totaled between 1,700 and 1,800 men but that this figure would be reduced to around 1,400 if we deduct those who hailed from West Jersey. Even 1,400 is a goodly number. That so many should have thrown in their lot with England was due to a variety of causes, a discussion of which is beyond the scope of our inquiry.

---

[63] *Greene Papers* in William Clements Library. Nathaniel Pendleton to Wade Hampton, September 17, 1781, "Rawdon is a prisoner of the French Fleet."

[64] *Clinton Papers.* Distribution of the army under the command of His Excellency General Sir Henry Clinton, February 15, 1782; March 1, 1782.

[65] "Extracts from Letter Book of Captain Johann Heinrichs, 1778-1780," p. 145.

With respect to the number of Catholics in that body we are left in uncertainty. Despite his active intervention in their behalf, despite every inducement he could hold out, Howe admitted that he corralled only 182 recruits for the Roman Catholic Volunteers. His efforts had failed. Later Clifton temporarily swelled the number to 331, but as this was achieved in New York, it is improbable that the increment were Pennsylvania men, for access to New York from Pennsylvania was difficult and even hazardous. Similarly, while the Volunteers of Ireland, the brain child of General Henry Clinton, came into existence in Philadelphia, the regiment attained maturity only after the British gave up that city and were relocated in New York, where Catholics were relatively few. Therefore it would seem a safe conclusion that this regiment likewise could not have included many Catholics from Philadelphia or Pennsylvania apart from the remnant of 80 Roman Catholic Volunteers transferred to it by Clinton.

Nevertheless Catholic patriots in Philadelphia were distressed by the conduct of these coreligionists and strove to deter them from this course of action. In an effort to dissuade them from aligning with the Tories a "Roman Catholic" addressed an open letter to John Dunlop,[67] the publisher of the *Pennsylvania Packet.* In this appeal the writer, with Ireland chiefly in mind, stressed "the abject state of servitude" of the Catholic subjects of the king. The record of "unrelenting severity" with which his government has "for so long a time pursued their brethren," should open the eyes of American Catholics to grim reality and quickly dissipate any lingering loyalty to such a sovereign.

---

[66] Siebert, *Loyalists*, p. 42.

Thanks to the researches of Martin I. J. Griffin,[68] we know that the Catholic Tory element in Philadelphia was not restricted to one class or to one national strain; it transcended such limitations. It was a cross section of society; it embraced men of every social group, and men of English, German, and Irish extraction. Foremost was Alfred Clifton, classified as English and a "gentleman," but associated with him were Reynolds the looking-glass maker; Bernard Fearis, a vendor; Dennis Dougherty, a shopkeeper, who sold rum, sugar, and snuff; Joseph Griswold the distiller; and John Bray, schoolmaster. Of the same mind as Clifton the Englishman were John Campbell, John Maguire, Patrick Tonry, Isaac Lort, James Wirth, Bryan O'Hara, James Byrne, Patrick Hogan, George Connell, Timothy Carroll, John Tolly, George Spangler, and Michael O'Connor. Evidently Toryism knew no social classification, blood lines, or religious homogeneity, and Catholics were not impervious to its appeal.

This should surprise no one; for human beings, regardless of social, religious, or racial ties and associations, do not act with the unanimity or solidarity postulated by Shea and others. As individuals varying in character and mental endowment they react differently to any given circumstances. An appeal which touches one or an argument which convinces another may leave a third person untouched or unconvinced. And this is especially true in times of stress, of crisis. Even though we may regret that Alfred Clifton, for example, could not appraise the situation as did Stephen Moylan and react in identical fashion, we should not deny that in this conflict of judgments both translated personal conviction into action. Nor are apologies necessary for people who persisted in an allegiance they had accepted and cherished from childhood. Conscious of their own rectitude, in their minds the patriots were the ones who in deviating from tradition and in renouncing hallowed loyalties incurred the stigma of disloyalty. Lacking evidence to the contrary, we must assume that some Tories were swayed by conviction and honorable motives. Certainly it would be arbitrary to impugn their motives and denounce them *en masse* as poltroons and vicious characters. That Toryism was widespread, that it knew no geographical boundaries and was not confined to any one section of the country, is revealed by the existence of such groups as the Loyal New Englanders, The New York Volunteers, the New Jersey Volunteers, the Pennsylvania Loyalists, the Bucks County Dragoons, the Maryland Loyalists, the South Carolina Royalists, the North Carolina Volunteers, the Georgia Loyalists, all of whom served under the British flag; and in addition there were other Tory groups, such as the Loyal American Regiment, the King's American Regiment, the Queen's American Rangers, the Prince of Wales American Volunteers, and others, which disregarded state boundaries and recruited anywhere.

---

[67] *Pennsylvania Packet* January 28, 1779.

[68] Griffin, "Catholic Loyalists of the Revolution," pp. 77-88.

It was inevitable that Catholics should be numbered among them, but the records prove that Bancroft's reckoning as to their number is at variance with the facts. Catholics were not inclined to Toryism to the degree he contends. For one thing Bancroft overrates the number of Catholic Tories in British service. While it is true that at one time the Roman Catholic Volunteers did number 331, they decreased so rapidly that when the regiment was abolished Clinton could transfer only 80 men to the Volunteers of Ireland. What had become of the other three-fourths?

Had they deserted *en masse* or been dismissed? At any rate, they had vanished. Again the "300 deserters," on the authority of Clinton himself, were assigned to the Volunteers of Ireland, not to the Roman Catholic Volunteers; and since the former was not an exclusively Catholic group, it would seem logical to infer that not all of these "deserters" could with certainty be classified as Catholics. Nowhere does Bancroft prove that they were or present evidence that suggests it. The impression that Bancroft created was highly uncomplimentary to Catholics, but it was wrong; in the face of the evidence we have presented it can no longer be sustained. It must be amended and brought into conformity with the facts.

CHAPTER XII

Conclusion

What, then, in summary was the record of American Catholics in the Revolution? How did they react to the situation, how respond to the summons of their country in her hour of gravest need? Did they acquit themselves as honorably as their neighbors of other faiths, pour out voluntarily, or hold back till goaded into action by physical force or public opinion? Did they come out in large numbers? Was their choice of sides easy or difficult? Were they of one mind or did they divide on the issue of continued allegiance or independence? How many American Catholics served under the American flag, what number remained under the British?

Any appraisal of human activity, be it that of an individual or a group, must take all circumstances into consideration if it would do justice to the party and be of real value. This postulates an understanding of the times, of the ideals, mores, and mind of the subjects of our study and analysis. In the conviction that the status of Catholics in the United States today, in respect to numbers and influence, tends to mislead those who are not fully conversant with conditions that prevailed in the colonies in and before 1776, we sketched the background against which the Catholics of 1776 were called upon to take a stand. For we may not indulge in facile assumptions that lack foundation in fact; neither may we apply to that generation a scale of values and standards they could not possibly have known, or ascribe to them the clearness of vision that is ours today. Anachronisms spell disaster for the historian. To us who enjoy the advantage of hindsight the alternative between patriot and Tory presents no problem; there appears to be no place for ambiguity; the choice seems quite obvious. But every schoolboy should be aware that the United States of 1776 differed from the United States of today; and every adult knows that it is one thing to continue to adhere to a government whose authority and legitimacy have never been questioned, and quite another, overnight as it were, to repudiate this allegiance and espouse a new government of doubtful viability. In appraising the conduct of the men of 1776 this must be remembered. In addition it is necessary to inquire whether any group—for example, the Catholics, who are the subject of our inquiry—found the decision more puzzling because of factors which affected them alone. In other words, was there anything in the record of the colonies, or in the status quo that obtained in 1776, that might have predisposed the minds of Catholics? Was there anything which touched them so deeply that it could outweigh every other consideration in determining their choice, something which could perhaps preclude one alternative? It is our conviction that there was just such a factor, and that the circumstance of its existence has been generally ignored or underestimated by scholars and denied proper recognition.

That factor was religious prejudice—biased prejudgment of a creed and a stubborn refusal to examine its tenets and practices. We limited our inquiry to the issue of whether there was anti-Catholic prejudice in England's American colonies, and whether it was so widespread and so dynamic that it could have alienated Catholics in 1776. With the origin of anti-Catholic prejudice we were not directly interested. Neither did we inquire whether it had its roots in national antagonisms or dogmatic differences, or whether it was the fruit of, and an inevitable reaction to, the policies pursued at home and abroad by certain Catholic governments in Europe.[1]

Our investigation revealed that intolerance of Catholics runs like a distinct thread through the fabric of colonial history. It appeared at the beginning of colonization and it persisted till the Declaration of Independence and beyond. In some form it is found in every colony, and even in Maryland, which was founded under Catholic auspices. Though there were high and low tides, periods when it was very much alive and periods when it was dormant, no colony, no decade, was spared its operation and consequences. The first settlers, apart from those in Maryland, were Protestant, many of them aggressive and militant, to whom popery and papists were utterly anathema. Children of their age and environment, they carried their apprehension from their homeland, and they did not discard it or outgrow it in the New World. Rather they took every precaution to immunize themselves against every encroachment or infiltration of the hated creed.

To some extent the wars with the French in Canada fostered and intensified the traditional attitude. These struggles for territory, power, fur, Indian trade and alliances took on the character of religious crusades in the estimation of many most sincere folk. French and Catholic were synonymous and equally abhorred. Louisburg was regarded as a citadel of popery, the stronghold of anti-Christ, no less than as a French bastion. As its reduction would deal a blow to the powers of evil, an expedition against it was a crusade which must elicit the boundless blessing of God.

---

[1] Let it be said in passing that we cannot subscribe to the view propounded in conversation that in 1776 the rank and file of the colonists did not regard as significant the theological differences that existed between Catholics and various Protestant denominations. Such a view ignores the content of the sermons of the period, contributions to the press, and countless other indications to the contrary. Ministers still belabored the Mass, confession, indulgences, purgatory, and so forth, and they were not apt to discourse on topics which their congregations regarded as mere minutiae. To do so would affront the intelligence of the audience, overtax their patience, endanger their own tenure. Nor can the reception by New Englanders of the exiled Canadians be advanced as conclusive evidence of the absence of religious animosity. People can be wonderfully inconsistent on occasion, and rise to heights of charity otherwise impossible to them. Witness, for example, the kindly reception in England of priests and nuns, emigrés from France, during the French Revolution, and the continued enforcement of penal laws against English Catholics, and the uninterrupted persecution of Irish Catholics, an inconsistency so glaring that it did not escape censure at the time and since.

In addition, intolerance in any form battens on ignorance, which in turn is perpetuated by lack of contact. Thus Protestants were prevented from discovering the true nature of Catholicism by inability or reluctance to associate with those whom they styled papists. Under the circumstances hoary legends survived and were amplified by accretion. The repeated publishing of Antonio Gavin's vile and salacious diatribe on Catholic belief and practice revealed the ability of people to relish such fare without suspecting that they were being victimized by a scoundrel who turned their credulity into a steppingstone to personal financial profit and popularity.

Nor was this spirit and attitude confined to the illiterate, who are always an easy prey for schemers. Nursed from childhood on the iniquities of the Inquisition and the horrors of Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*, the educated likewise succumbed, and were protagonists of opposition to everyone and everything Catholic. The Dudleian lectures at Harvard were inspired by the desire to cultivate the belief that the Catholic religion was a tissue of absurdities, the bankruptcy or suicide of reason, the stifling of common sense, idolatry no less hateful than that of Romans or other pagans. For this reason they were acclaimed even by men of distinction such as John Adams. One of the cycle of four was to transmit the tradition that Catholics because of their creed were incapable of patriotism but capable of any misdeed and, given the opportunity, were bound in conscience to perpetuate any crime against their Protestant neighbors. They were a fifth column, treacherous, vindictive, merciless.

In the crusade against popery and papists the New England clergy presented a solid front, and they had numerous auxiliaries in other areas.[2] In their pulpits they thundered against the iniquities of the whore of Babylon just as vigorously as they expounded the Gospel or exhorted to charity and a virtuous life. And Sam Adams, for reasons best known to himself, could use a Boston public gazette to broadcast his conviction that popery was the greatest of foes, alert the people to their peril, and rejuvenate the spirit of opposition to papistry which, in his opinion, had relaxed to their jeopardy. The press and the pulpit united in alliance, and with nauseating regularity maintained that papists were the instruments of the evil powers of earth and hell, emissaries of the enemy, pharisaically biding their time till they could exterminate or enslave all Protestants, seize power, and set up a tyranny parallel to that of France or Spain, the traditional opponents of Protestantism.

The Quebec Act of 1774 quickened the tempo of the campaign. Liberal space in the press was given to every damning charge against papists. The old legends were resuscitated, new charges were fabricated. Solomon Southwick in his *Newport Mercury* excelled in villification, but other champions of the fourth estate vied with him. In issue after issue readers were regaled with accounts of what Catholics had done and with prophecy of what they could do if occasion should arise. Since colonial editors were sensitive to public opinion and would not admit to their columns anything that might offend readers and sacrifice their limited subscribers, we may consequently infer how prevalent were dislike, distrust, even hatred of Catholics and their religion. Even in Pennsylvania and Maryland the press featured such articles and news items. And not a few of the men who presently were leaders in the independence movement had distinguished themselves in the agitation.[3] What, then, must Catholics conclude as to the opinion entertained of them by those of other faiths? No extraordinary degree of discernment was needed to realize that mere sufferance was the best that they could look for.

---

[2] Metzger, *Quebec Act*, Chap. 5.

The Dulany-Carroll controversy may serve as an index of the situation. In this dispute over an extraneous issue Carroll's Catholic religion was dragged in and made the subject of reproach. The implications of Dulany's taunt were obvious. Because of his creed Carroll could not be a gentleman, an upright citizen, a man of irreproachable character. Denial of suffrage and exclusion from public office were justified even in his case, despite his wealth and wide connections. If so conspicuous a citizen as Charles Carroll could be dealt with in this summary manner, what must have been the experience of his humble coreligionists? The lot of the average Catholic man or woman was hard and disheartening. However properly they comported themselves, however blameless their conduct, they would not be accepted without reserve or as equals. The dreary past depressed them; the future promised little improvement; at best they would still be half-citizens, privileged to pay taxes but not to vote or hold office.

In addition, the circumstance that the conflict was widely branded a Presbyterian war might well have had a deterring effect on Catholics. Even such staunch defenders of America as Edmund Burke and Isaac Barre were said to be persuaded that the Presbyterians "were among the most active and instrumental in exciting, urging on, and accomplishing the revolutionary movement in America."[4] If such was the character of the war, why, then, should the Catholics become involved? Why embroil themselves in the affairs of these people or intervene in their behalf? Most certainly Catholics knew no moral obligation or debt of gratitude to New England or to the followers of Calvin and John Knox. Why then should they aid their traditional critics and open enemies? Did not Ezra Stiles, in exuberance of spirit, predict that New England would annex a great area to the south and west and impose Presbyterianism as the state religion? Granted that the Catholics of that day did not have access to the diary of the worthy divine, was not his prophecy really the expression of an ambition and hope widely entertained? Why should Catholics extend themselves to bring about the realization of a prediction which implied still worse prospects for themselves? This would be sheer folly, stark madness, a betrayal of their creed.

---

[3] *Ibid.*, Chap. 6.

[4] *Society of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick*, p. 13.

Such was the background, such the situation that Catholics faced in 1776. With the unhappy past fresh in their memory, the future shrouded in uncertainty, and neutrality ruled out by the Declaration of Independence, there seemed to be no escape from the Scylla of supporting their foes of yesterday or the Charybdis of provoking new outbursts of hostility and persecution if they stayed loyal to England. The one would entrench the Presbyterian ascendancy and open the way to the realization of the prognostication of Stiles; the other would multiply their present woes.

Colonial enmity towards popery and papists was in the best English Protestant tradition. It was of such long standing and so rock-ribbed that it seemed endowed with permanence. And there are those who assure us that certain national moods, certain international friendships or animosities, are so fixed and permanent that they will endure forever. But time corrodes and disarranges the works of men. History delights in the irony of recasting in new molds the arrangements that men hailed as immune to change; Clio loves to confound the arrogance of men and make sport of their boasted finality by interposing new circumstances which undo the past, derange hallowed assumptions, and give birth to new associations of individuals and nations. The enemies of today become tomorrow's allies and attain respectability, while the allies of today are somehow found to be scoundrels and villains bereft of elementary decency.

As a rupture with England loomed, and then became a reality, the leaders of the new America awoke to the desirability of attaching the Catholics to their cause. In any case there was bound to be an opposition or Tory element in secret sympathy or in open association with the enemy. If the Catholics should unite with this group, the consequences might prove critical, even disastrous, especially in Maryland and Pennsylvania, where Catholics constituted a quite considerable segment of the population. This development must be averted. Every means to that end must be exhausted. Therefore, regardless of the past, provocation must cease, and they must be wooed and won. Besides, if the United States should ever solicit the assistance of Catholic France, it was desirable that in advance of official overtures the Catholics of America should be associated with the patriots and pledged to their cause. It is truly remarkable how quickly some coats were turned to conform to the new point of view. Men such as Samuel Cooper, notorious for declaiming against popery and everything French, suddenly discovered redeeming features, even excellencies, in these ertswhile adversaries. On the surface there was a change of heart at high levels, and the press fell into line; that portion of the press which upheld the patriot cause by and large ceased to fulminate against the Catholics and the French. But the Tory press hilariously upbraided the reformed patriots and Congress, with emphasis on short memories, sudden conversion, and what was said to be tantamount to an acceptance of popery. The antithesis between their past and the present utterances was so astounding that the mere juxtaposition sufficed to raise the issue of their veracity or their soundness of mind. There were of course some expressions of hearty disapprobation in the old manner, but the outcry evoked by the Quebec Act subsided. In the emergency Catholics and Frenchmen were no longer the ogres of old; they might prove to be acceptable; they should be tolerated, even patronized; their aid was desirable.

Catholics may well have been bewildered by the turn of events—the situation was unprecedented, it taxed credulity. There was ample basis for Boucher's statement that they were perplexed by developments. To a man they might suspect deception in the making, a trick to entice them into commitments to their detriment. Conservatives might adopt a judicious reserve; timid souls might be unnerved by doubt and misgiving. Should they act? What should they do? To whom should they turn for enlightenment and guidance? There was no one vested with authority to formulate a policy binding on all. The novelty of the situation, the complexity of the issue, the attraction of arguments inviting to either side have not received due consideration, and thus Catholics have been denied full credit for their eventual decision.

No other religious community found the choice so difficult. Dr. Peter Guilday only stated an unpalatable truth when he observed that Catholics were conscious of little difference between the combatants; and he added that the wonder is that, in view of the century and more of harsh treatment, they did not attempt to remain neutral. And when the Declaration of Independence eliminated that possibility and offered only the alternative of being for or against the Revolution, in favor of England or the United States, they may well have felt kindly towards England because of the liberal religious adjustments of the recent Quebec Act. At any rate, they knew no reason for gratitude, no sense of indebtedness towards those who led or backed the new regime. It may be that a number of Marylanders were swayed by the decision of Charles Carroll; but many in Maryland as in Pennsylvania, acting as individuals, elected the patriot over the royal cause. They resolved to ignore or forgive the past and risk the future.

They may have been moved by the hope that a new page of history was being written, and that out of this ordeal understanding and toleration might emerge to replace the inequities of the past and extend into the future.

In some detail we have sketched the response of Catholics in the two chief centers of Catholic population. We saw that even before the Declaration of Independence there were Catholics among the troops rushed by Smallwood and Moylan to the relief of Boston, that hotbed of anti-Catholic bitterness and propaganda. In this connection we must bear in mind that the history of the colonies reveals how self-centered each was, how engrossed in promoting its own interests that it cared little about the fate of the others; that each regarded all but its own citizens as quasi-aliens and opponents. If this was true of colonies with common borders, it was even more true of those more remote with whom there were few if any contacts. In view of this excessive provincialism the assistance rendered by Maryland and Pennsylvania to Boston was particularly significant and magnanimous. New England's religious history made it doubly so as far as Catholics were concerned.

We found Catholics in the Maryland militia, in the corps raised by Moylan, and in other regiments in Pennsylvania. Geography and military needs assigned a preponderant number of Maryland Catholics to the militia, while in Pennsylvania they joined the Continental Army. The past notwithstanding, Catholic participation in the war for independence was generous in Maryland and Pennsylvania, where a remarkable number of men took up arms. On the land and on the sea, in the various armed services, in diplomatic posts, in local government, they collaborated with their Protestant brethren; they contributed funds and personal service. Not a few died on the battlefield on Long Island and elsewhere; others languished in prison ships. All in all they contributed to the common cause far in excess of their ratio to the total population.

But it is wrong to overrate the allegiance and outpouring of Catholics as John Gilmary Shea and others have done; it is contrary to fact that to a man they were in the patriot camp, that there was not a single Catholic Tory. Men do not act in this uniform way; such perfect unanimity is unattainable in human relations. However general a stand or an opinion may be, some will disagree. In other words, while the vast majority of Catholics were patriots, there were also Catholic Tories, men who sided with England, impelled, it may be, by conscience, or for other reasons. In this respect Maryland and Pennsylvania contrast sharply. In the former Catholic Tories were negligible, so few that we have discovered no mention of or allusion to them in official documents, in the press, or in other sources. In the latter, on the contrary, they were sufficiently numerous to inspire General Howe with the idea of forming the Roman Catholic Volunteers and to induce General Clinton to institute the Volunteers of Ireland. The careers of these Tory groups have been outlined; but there can be no doubt that even in Philadelphia, Catholics were in sharp disagreement with this minority bloc because their loyalty was strong and it was to the patriots.

It is not easy to explain this disparity between Maryland and Pennsylvania. Could it be that since the people in Maryland, Catholics and Protestants, were so largely of English stock the rights and liberties of British subjects were better understood and so highly prized that any violation or threat instinctively aroused opposition? For, even though Catholics were in large measure outside the current of politics, they nonetheless retained an interest in political issues because of possible consequences to themselves. Then too there was the circumstance that, as the Maryland Catholics resided in counties peculiarly exposed to British raids, they were driven to join the militia to protect themselves and their property, because the enemy was not inclined to indulge in nice distinctions between the property of those hostile to them and that of the well-affected. For Marylanders it was therefore literally a case of defending themselves, their dear ones, their all.

In Pennsylvania, however, the population in general and Catholics in particular were a heterogeneous group, socially, linguistically, ethnically dissimilar, with Germans predominant. To them, especially if they dwelt in communities of their own or were only partially assimilated, the issues at stake might appear obscure, perhaps even devoid of meaning. What did the rights or liberties of British subjects mean to them? They lacked the tradition and the background that fitted them to attach to these rights the value instinctive to those of British birth or lineage. Did not the patriot leaders in effect recognize this situation by shifting from stress on the rights of Englishmen to emphasis on the more comprehensive rights of men, so as to appeal to men of every national extraction? Moreover, apart from one period, their persons, homes, shops, and farms were not endangered. And if they were to engage in combat, it must be at a distance, among strangers who spoke a language they understood imperfectly if at all; and it is possible that Catholic Tories were tainted with the pacifism of the Quakers. Many of these Quakers were Germans who hailed from the same principalities as their Catholic neighbors. Quaker opposition to warfare stemmed from their creed; it was reinforced by humanitarianism and economic considerations. Discussion with these pacifists may have deafened and blinded some Catholics to the urgency for a change in allegiance. Finally, we must not overlook or underestimate the fact that the government of Pennsylvania had always been, and still was, singularly tolerant of Catholics, whereas in Maryland, ever since 1691, penal legislation hampered Catholics and begot anxiety and fear. With these facts in mind the Catholics of Pennsylvania may well have concluded let the status quo prevail! Why should they tamper with it? Why should they court uncertainty and, in addition, risk disruption of business ties and personal loss?

The conclusion forced on us by the evidence at hand is that Catholics responded promptly and most generously to the call for defenders of America, and played their due part in making independence a reality. On their own initiative they espoused the patriot cause. Equally evident is it that circumstances not of their making rendered their adherence to the champions of freedom and independence extremely difficult, and that they divided on the issue. While some remained steadfast in their old allegiance and fought for its continuance, the majority were to be found under the American flag. The record of American Catholics was such that, then and later, they were proud of it. Without misgiving or fear of contradiction they dwelt on it in a public address tendered to Washington when he took office as the first president of the new republic. Catholics need resort to no fictitious or exaggerated claims; their record spoke for itself. It was eloquent of their patriotism, and patent to all who were not blinded by prejudice. In his reply to the Address of Catholics, President Washington added his testimony to their loyalty. And he, above all others, was in a position to know the full truth. No testimonial to their patriotic endeavors could be so gratifying as an encomium by the father of our country. This the Catholics possessed and treasured, for this was highest commendation and supreme approval.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

During the research preparatory to writing, every lead was explored that seemed even remotely to promise information on the subject of our inquiry. Since in so many instances these promises proved unrewarding, we believe that such books, pamphlets, sermons, diaries, and documents deserve no mention in this bibliography. In general the richest sources of information were the records of the early parishes in St. Mary's and Charles counties in Maryland, and similar records of parishes in Philadelphia and vicinity. Next in value and helpfulness were contemporary diaries of clergymen, soldiers, merchants, and travelers, and the manuscripts to be found in the libraries of the Maryland and the Pennsylvania historical societies.

Unpublished Documents

Archives of the Archdiocese of Baltimore.

Balch Papers. Pennsylvania Historical Society Library.

Baptism and Marriage Register of St. Joseph's Church, Philadelphia.

Baptisms and Marriages at St. Inigoe's (Arnold Lievers).

Catholic University of America Transcripts.

Father Farmer's Marriage Records. Woodstock College Library.

Father Walton's Diary and Record of Baptisms and Marriages.

Gage Papers. American Series. William Clements Library.

Genealogical Collections. Maryland Historical Society.

Greene Papers. William Clements Library.

Henry Clinton Papers. William Clements Library.

Index of Names—Militia Lists, Regular Troops. Maryland Historical Society.

Index of Names—Regular Troops. Maryland Historical Society.

Journal of Correspondence of the Council of Safety. Maryland Historical Society.

Maryland Revolutionary War. Maryland Historical Society.

Militia Lists. Maryland Historical Society.

Muster Rolls and Other Records of Service of Maryland Troops in the American Revolution. Maryland Historical Society.

Orderly Book of General Howe, March 9, 1776—May 1, 1778. William Clements Library.

Revolutionary War Commissions. Maryland Historical Society.

Sackville—Germain Papers. William Clements Library.

Published Documents

Adams, Charles F., editor. *Familiar Letters of John Adams and His Wife Abigail during the Revolution*. New York, 1875.

Archives of the Pennsylvania Historical Society.

Barbé-Marbois, François de. *Our Revolutionary Forefathers: Letters of François de Barbé-Marbois*. New York, 1929.

Burnett, Edmund C., editor. *Letters of the Members of the Continental Congress*. 8 vols. Washington, 1921-1938.

Carter, Clarence E. *Correspondence of General Thomas Gage with Secretaries of State, 1763-1775*. 2 vols. New Haven, 1931-1933.

Collections of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society.

Collections of the New York Historical Society.

Collections of the Worcester Society of Antiquities.

Connecticut Historical Society Collections.

Duane, William. *Return of the Whole Number of Persons within the Several Districts of the United States*. Washington, 1802.

Essex Institute Historical Collections.

Force, Peter, editor. *American Archives*. Fourth series, 6 vols. Washington, 1837-1846.

——— *American Archives*. Fifth series, 9 vols. Washington, 1837-1853.

Ford, Worthington C., editor. *The Washington—Duché Letters*. Brooklyn, 1890.

Ford, Worthington C. and Gaillard Hunt, editors. *The Journals of the Continental Congress*. 34 vols. Washington, 1904-1937.

Francis, Philip. *The Francis Letters*. 2 vols. New York, 1901.

Gibbes, R. W. *Documentary History of the American Revolution, 1764-1776*. New York, 1855.

Griffith, Thomas W. *Annals of Baltimore*. Baltimore, 1824.

Henry, William Wirt. *Patrick Henry: Life, Correspondence and Speeches*. 3 vols. New York, 1891.

Hodges, Margaret. *Unpublished Revolutionary Records of Maryland*. 6 vols. 1939-1941.

Howe, William. *The Narrative of Lieut. Gen. William Howe, in a Committee of the House of Commons, on the 29th of April 1779*. London, 1780.

Hughes, Thomas. *The History of the Society of Jesus in North America*. Documents. 2 vols. London and New York, 1908.

Johnston, Henry P., editor. *The Correspondence and Public Papers of John Jay*. 4 vols. New York, 1890-1893.

Massachusetts Historical Society Proceedings.

Morgan, John A., editor. *Annual Catalogues of the Maryland Mission of the Society of Jesus, 1634-1808*. Woodstock College Library.

Newman, Harry W. *Maryland Revolutionary Records*. Washington, 1938.

O'Callaghan, E. B. *Documentary History of the State of New York*. 4 vols. Albany, 1849-1851.

"Record of Servants and Apprentices Bound and Assigned before Hon. John Gibson, Mayor of Philadelphia, December 5, 1772—May 21, 1773." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, Vol. 33, October 1909.

Records of the Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia.

"Report of the Committee on Linguistic and National Stocks." *American Historical Society Report for 1931*.

Saffell, W. T. R. *Records of the Revolutionary War*. New York, 1858.

Scharf, J. Thomas. *Chronicles of Baltimore*. Baltimore, 1874.

Stevens, B. F. *Facsimiles of Manuscripts in European Archives Relating to America, 1773-1783*. London, 1892.

The Votes and Proceedings of the Freeholders and Inhabitants of the Town of Boston. Boston, 1772.

Warren-Adams Letters. 2 vols. Boston, 1917.

"Warren-Adams Letters." *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*. Vol. 73, 1925.

Washington, George. *The Writings of George Washington*, edited by John Fitzpatrick. 39 vols. Washington, 1931-1944.

Secondary Works

Albright, Raymond W. *Two Centuries of Reading, Pennsylvania.* Reading, 1948.

Alvord, Clarence W. *The Mississippi Valley in British Politics.* 2 vols. Cleveland, 1917.

Andrews, Matthew Page. *The History of Maryland: Province and State.* Garden City, 1929.

Austin, James T. *The Life and Contemporary Letters of Elbridge Gerry.* 2 vols. Boston, 1828.

Bailey, J. R. *A Brief Sketch of the History of the Catholic Church on the Island of New York.* New York, 1853.

Baisnée, Jules A. *France and the Establishment of the American Hierarchy.* Baltimore, 1934.

Baldwin, Alice M. *The New England Clergy and the American Revolution.* Durham, 1928.

Bancroft, George. *The History of the Formation of the Constitution of the United States.* 2 vols. New York, 1882.

——— *The History of the United States.* 6 vols. Boston, 1883-1885.

——— *The History of the United States.* 10 vols. Boston, 1834-1874.

Barker, Charles A. *The Background of the Revolution in Maryland.* New Haven, 1940.

Bigelow, E. Victor. *Narrative History of Cohasset.* Boston, 1898.

Bolton, Ethel S. "Immigrants to New England, 1700-1775." *Essex Institute Historical Collections.*

Boyle, John. *American Chronicles of the Times.* Boston, 1775.

A Brief Account of the Society of the Friendly Sons of Saint Patrick. Philadelphia, 1844.

Briggs, C. A. *American Presbyterianism.* New York, 1885.

Brown, Allen. *An Outline History of the Presbyterian Church in West and South Jersey from 1700-1865.* Philadelphia, 1869.

Brunhouse, Robert S. *The Counter Revolution in Pennsylvania.* Harrisburg, 1942.

Carey, Mathew. *The Olive Branch or Faults on Both Sides.* 2 vols. Philadelphia, 1815.

Cobb, Sanford. *The Rise of Religious Liberty in America.* New York, 1902.

Collins, Varnum Lansing. *President Witherspoon.* 2 vols. Princeton, 1925.

Coverley, Roger de. *The American Roused in a Cure for the Spleen or Amusement for a Winter's Evening.* Boston, 1775.

Cross, Arthur. *The Anglican Episcopacy and the American Revolution.* New York, 1902.

Crowl, Philip A. *Maryland during and after the Revolution.* Baltimore, 1943.

Curtis, E. E. *The Organization of the British Army in the American Revolution.* New Haven, 1926.

Dodderidge, Joseph. *Notes on the Settlement and Indian Wars of the Western Parts of Virginia and Pennsylvania.* Wellburgh, 1824.

Donovan, George F. *The Pre-Revolutionary Irish in Massachusetts, 1620-1775.* Menasha, 1931.

Dunaway, Wayland F. *The Scotch-Irish of Colonial Pennsylvania.* Chapel Hill, 1944.

Emmet, Thomas Addis. "Irish Emigration during the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries." *Journal of the American Irish Historical Society,* Vol. 2, 1899.

Fink, Leo G. *Old Jesuit Trails in Penn's Forest.* New York, 1936.

Glasgow, Margaret. *The Scotch-Irish in Northern Ireland and in American Colonies.* New York, 1936.

Gordon, Thomas F. *History of Pennsylvania.* Philadelphia, 1829.

Greene, E. B. and Virginia Harrington. *American Population before the Federal Census of 1790.* New York, 1932.

Griffin, Martin I. J. "Catholic Loyalists of the Revolution." *American Catholic Historical Researches,* January 1889.

——— *Catholics and the American Revolution.* 3 vols. Ridley Park and Philadelphia, 1907-1911.

——— *History of "Old Saint Joseph's," Philadelphia.* Philadelphia, 1882.

——— "Irish Catholics and the Revolution." *American Catholic Historical Researches,* Vol. 27, 1910.

Griffith, Thomas W. *Sketches of the Early History of Maryland.* Baltimore, 1821.

Guilday, Peter. *John Carroll*. New York, 1922.

Hall, Clayton C., editor. *Narratives of Early Maryland*. New York, 1910.

Haltigan, James. *The Irish in the American Revolution*. Washington, 1908.

Hartley, Cecil B. *Heroes and Patriots of the South*. Philadelphia, 1860.

Hawke, Francis L. *Contributions to the Ecclesiastical History of the United States*. New York, 1839.

Headley, J. T. *The Chaplains and Clergy of the Revolution*. New York, 1864.

Jameson, J. Franklin. *The American Revolution Considered as a Social Movement*. Princeton, 1940.

Jingle, Bob. *Bob Jingle*. New York, 1774.

Klett, Guy S., editor. *The Presbyterian Church and Our National Foundation*. Philadelphia, 1937.

Koch, G. Adolph. *Republican Religion*. New York, 1933.

Kuhns, Oscar. *The German and Swiss Settlements of Colonial Pennsylvania*. New York, 1901.

Laycock, John. *The Fall of British Tyranny or American Liberty Triumphant*. Philadelphia, 1775.

Lundin, Clarence. *Cockpit of the Revolution*. Princeton, 1940.

M'Clune, James. *The History of the Presbyterian Church in the Forks of the Brandywine, Chester Co. Pa., 1735-1885*. Philadelphia, 1885.

McCrady, Edward. *The History of South Carolina in the Revolution, 1775-1780*. New York, 1901.

McGee, Thomas D'Arcy. *A History of the Irish Settlers in North America from the Earliest Period to the Census of 1850*. Boston, 1855.

McSherry, James. *History of Maryland*. Baltimore, 1850.

Maginnis, Thomas H. *The Irish Contribution to America's Independence*. Philadelphia, 1913.

Marmion, Anthony. *The Ancient and Modern History of the Maritime Ports of Ireland*. London, 1855.

Matthews, William. *American Diaries. An Annotated Bibliography of American Diaries Written prior to the Year 1861*. Berkeley, 1945.

Metzger, Charles H. *The Quebec Act*. New York, 1936.

Millett, D. C. *The History of the Parish of St. Thomas Church, Whitemarsh, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania*. Doylestown, 1864.

Montgomery, Morton L. *The History of Berks County in Pennsylvania.* Philadelphia, 1886.

Moore, Frank. *Diary of the American Revolution.* 2 vols. New York, 1860.

——— *Patriot Preachers of the Revolution.* New York, 1852.

Morison, Samuel E. *Builders of the Bay Colony.* Boston, 1930.

Morse, Jedidiah. *Annals of the American Revolution; or A Record of the Causes and Events.* Hartford, 1824.

Myers, Albert C. *Immigration of Irish Quakers into Pennsylvania, 1682-1750.* Swarthmore, 1902.

Nolan, J. Bennett. *Southeastern Pennsylvania.* Philadelphia, 1943.

O'Brien, Michael J. *A Hidden Phase of the American Revolution.* New York, 1920.

Parsons, Usher. *The Life of William Pepperell.* Boston, 1856.

Pastor, Ludwig. *The History of the Popes,* translated by E. F. Peeler. St. Louis, 1923—.

Proud, Robert. *History of Pennsylvania in North America.* 2 vols. Philadelphia, 1797, 1798.

Quincy, Josiah. *The History of Harvard College.* 2 vols. Boston, 1860.

Ramsay, David. *History of the American Revolution.* 2 vols. London, 1793; Charleston, 1809.

Reed, William B. *Life and Correspondence of Joseph Reed.* 2 vols. Philadelphia, 1847.

Reily, John T. *Conewago.* Martinsburg, 1885.

Ridgely, David. *Annals of Annapolis.* Baltimore, 1841.

Riley, Elihu. *The Ancient City—History of Annapolis in Maryland.* Annapolis, 1887.

Rupp, I. Daniel. *History of the Counties of Berks and Lebanon.* Lancaster, 1844.

——— *History of York County.* Lancaster, 1845.

Russell, William T. *Maryland: The Land of Sanctuary.* Baltimore, 1907.

Scharf, J. Thomas. *History of Maryland.* 3 vols. Baltimore, 1879.

Scharf, J. Thomas and Thompson Westcott. *History of Philadelphia, 1609-1884.* 3 vols. Philadelphia, 1884.

Sedgwick, Theodore. *Memoir to the Life of William Livingston.* New York, 1833.

Shea, John G. "The Catholic Church in American History." *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, Vol. 1, January 1876.

——— "Catholics and Catholicity in the Days of the American Revolution." *Proceedings of the First Meeting Held by the United States Catholic Historical Society at the University Club Theatre, New York City, Thursday, May 10, 1885.* New York, 1885.

Siebert, Wilbur H. *The Loyalists of Pennsylvania.* Columbus, 1905.

Sloan, D. H. *A History of the Presbytery of Kittaning.* Pittsburgh, 1888.

Stille, Charles J. *Major General Wayne and the Pennsylvania Line.* Philadelphia, 1893.

——— "Religious Tests in Provincial Pennsylvania." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, January 1886.

Tarleton, Banastre. *History of the Campaigns of 1780 and 1781.* Dublin, 1787.

Thomas, James W. *Chronicles of Colonial Maryland.* Cumberland, 1913.

Thornton, John W. *The Pulpit of the American Revolution.* Boston, 1860.

Treacy, William P. *Old Catholic Maryland.* Swedesboro, n.d.

Trumbull, John. *M'Fingal.* Philadelphia, 1776.

——— *Progress of Dullness.* Philadelphia, 1776.

Tudor, William. *Life of James Otis.* Boston, 1823.

Tyler, Moses C. *The Literary History of the American Revolution.* 2 vols. New York, 1897.

Van Tyne, Claude H. *The Causes of the War of Independence.* New York, 1922.

Willard, Margaret W., editor. *Letters on the American Revolution.* Boston, 1925.

Williams, T. J. C. and Folger McKinsey. *History of Frederick County, Maryland.* 2 vols. Frederick, 1910.

Zwinge, Joseph. "The Jesuit Farms in Maryland." *Woodstock Letters*, Vol. 42, number 2.

Diaries, Memoirs, Letters*

Achenwall, Gottfried. *Achenwall's Observations on North America*, translated by J. G. Rosengarten. Philadelphia, 1903.

---

* Although a thorough canvass was made of the diaries listed by William Matthews which appeared to be promising, the listing of those which contributed nothing whatever to the subject of our inquiry seems to be quite pointless.

Anburey, Thomas. *Travels through the Interior Parts of America.* Boston and New York, 1923.

Asbury, Francis. *An Extract from the Journal of Francis Asbury.* Philadelphia, 1802.

Barber, Daniel. *The History of My Own Times.* Washington, 1827.

Baurmeister, Carl Leopold. *Letters to Colonel von Junkeen Written during the Philadelphia Campaign, 1777-1778*, edited by Bernhard A. Uhlendorf and Edna Vosper. Philadelphia, 1937.

Belknap, Jeremy. "Journal of Rev. Jeremy Belknap 1775." *Massachusetts Historical Society Proceedings*, first series, Vol. 4, 1858-1860.

Berkenhout, John. "Journal of an Excursion from New York to Philadelphia in the Year 1778." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, Vol. 65, January 1941.

Blanchard, Claude. *The Journal of Claude Blanchard*, edited by Thomas Balch, translated by William Duane. Albany, 1876.

Boucher, Jonathan. *Reminiscences of an American Loyalist.* New York, 1925.

——— *A View of the Causes and Consequences of the American Revolution.* London, 1797.

Bourg, Cromot du. "Diary of a French Officer 1781." *Magazine of American History*, 1880.

Breck, Samuel. *Recollections of Samuel Breck*, edited by H. E. Scudder. Philadelphia, 1877.

Burnaby, Thomas. *Burnaby's Travels through the Interior Parts of North America.* New York, 1902; Boston, 1923.

Clayton, Robert. *Captain Robert Clayton's Orderly Book, 1777-1778.* Pennsylvania Historical Society Library.

Cresswell, Nicholas. *The Journal of Nicholas Cresswell, 1774-1777.* New York, 1924.

Curwen, Samuel. *Journal and Letters of Samuel Curwen*, edited by George A. Ward. New York, 1842.

Drayton, John. *Memoirs of the American Revolution, John Drayton.* 2 vols. Charleston, 1821.

Ellery, William. "Diary of Hon. William Ellery of Rhode Island, June 28—July 23, 1778." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, 1888.

Fisher, Samuel Rowland. "The Journal of Samuel Rowland Fisher," edited by Anna W. Morris. *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, Vol. 41, 1917.

Fithian, Philip Vickers. *Philip Vickers Fithian: Journal, 1775-1776*, edited by Robert G. Albion and Leonidas Dodson. Princeton, 1934.

Graydon, Alexander. *Memoirs of His Own Times—Alexander Graydon*, edited by John S. Littell. Philadelphia, 1846.

Heinrichs, Johann. "Extracts from the Letter Book of Captain Johann Heinrichs," translated by Julius F. Sachse. *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, Vol. 22, 1898.

Hendricks, William. *A Journal of the March of a Party of Provincials from Carlisle to Boston*. Glasgow, 1776. *Archives of the Pennsylvania Historical Society*, second series, Vol. 15.

Henshaw, William. *The Orderly Book of Colonel William Henshaw*. Worcester, 1912.

Honyman, Robert. *Colonial Panorama 1775, Dr. Robert Honyman's Journal*, edited by Philip Padelford. San Marino, 1939.

Johnson, Amandus. *The Journal and Biography of Nicholas Collin, 1746-1831*. Philadelphia, 1936.

Kemble, Stephen. "The Kemble Papers." *Collections of the New York Historical Society for 1883*. New York, 1883.

Kirkwood, Robert. "The Journal and Orderly Book of Captain Robert Kirkwood." *Delaware Historical Society Publication*, 1910.

McClure, David. *The Diary of David McClure*, edited by Franklin B. Dexter. New York, 1899.

McMichael, James. "Diary of Lt. James McMichael, 1776-1778." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, Vol. 16, number 2, July 1892.

McRoberts, Patrick. "A Tour through Part of the North Provinces of America, 1774-1775." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, Vol. 59, 1935.

——— *Tour through Part of the Northern Provinces of America*, edited by Carl Bridenbaugh. Philadelphia, 1935.

Marshall, Christopher. *Extracts from the Diary of Christopher Marshall*, edited by William Duane. Albany, 1877.

Montresor, John. "Military Journal January 1777—December 1778." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, 1881.

Muhlenberg, Henry. *The Journals of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg*, translated by Theodore G. Tappert, edited by John W. Doberstein. Philadelphia, 1945.

"Orderly Book of the Pennsylvania State Regiment of Foot, May 10 to August 16, 1777." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, Vol. 22, April 1898.

Popp, Stephen. "Popp's Journal, 1777-1783." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, 1902.

Reeves, Enos. "Extracts from the Letter Books of Lt. Enos Reeves." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, January 1897.

"Return of the Officers of the 4th Regt Light Dragoons Belonging to the State of Pennsylvania, January 25, 1781." *Archives of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania.*

Robin, Claude. *New Travels through North America*, translated by Philip Freneau. Philadelphia, 1783.

Scull, G. D., editor. "Montresor Journals." *Collections of the New York Historical Society for the Year 1881*. New York, 1882.

Serle, Ambrose. *The American Journal of Ambrose Serle*, edited by Edward H. Tatum, Jr. San Marino, 1940.

Smyth, J. F. D. *A Tour in the United States of America*. London, 1784.

Stiles, Ezra. *The Literary Diary of Ezra Stiles*, edited by Franklin B. Dexter. 2 vols. New York, 1901.

Stokes, N. Phelps. *Iconography of Manhattan Island*. 6 vols. New York, 1915-1928.

Thacker, James. *Military Journal during the American Revolutionary War, from 1775 to 1783*. Hartford, 1854.

Watson,Elkanah. *Men and Times of the American Revolution: Memoirs of Elkanah Watson*, edited by Winslow Watson. New York, 1857.

Willard, Joseph. "Extracts from Mr. (Joseph) Willard's Diary." *Collections of the Worcester Society of Antiquities*, 1895.

Contemporary Essays and Pamphlets

Adams, John. *On Canon and Feudal Law*. In *Works*, Vol. 3, edited by Charles F. Adams. 10 vols. Boston, 1850-1856.

The Address of the People of Great Britain to the Inhabitants of America. London, 1775.

Bernard, Thomas. *An Appeal to the Public, Stating and Considering the Objections to the Quebec Bill.* London, 1774.

Chandler, Thomas B. *What Think Ye of Congress Now? or An Enquiry How Far the Americans Are Bound to Abide by, and Execute the Decisions of the Late Congress.* New York, 1775.

Cooper, Samuel. *A Friendly Address to All Reasonable Americans on the Subject of Our Present Political Confusions; in Which the Necessary Consequences of Violently Opposing the King's Troops, and of a General Non-importation Are Fairly Stated.* New York, 1774.

[Franklin, Benjamin.] *Plain Truth; or Serious Considerations on the Present State of the City of Philadelphia and Province of Pennsylvania, by a Tradesman of Philadelphia.* Philadelphia, 1747.

Galloway, Joseph. *A Candid Examination of the Mutual Claims of Great Britain and the Colonies; with a Plan of Accomodation on Constitutional Principles.* New York, 1775.

[Inglis, Charles]. *The Letters of Papinian.* Philadelphia, 1776.

Leonard, Daniel. *Massachusettensis: or A Series of Letters, Containing a Faithful Statement of Many Important and Striking Facts Which Laid the Foundations of the Present Troubles in the Province of Massachusetts.* Boston, 1775.

[Samuel Seabury]. *The Congress Canvassed; or An Examination into the Conduct of the Delegates, at Their Grand Convention, Held in Philadelphia, September 1, 1775.* New York, 1775.

Sermons

Ballentine, John. The Importance of God's Presence with an Army Going against the Enemy, and the Grounds on Which It May Be Expected. Represented in a Sermon Preached June 2, 1756 just before Captain John Mosely and His Company Began Their March towards Crown Point. Boston, 1756.

Clarke, John. Sermons of the Late John Clarke, Sermon 8. *The Office of Reason in Religion.* Boston, 1779.

Cooper, Samuel. Discourse on the Man of Sin; Delivered in the Chapel of Harvard College, September 1, 1773. Boston, 1774.

Dana, James. A Sermon before the General Assembly of Connecticut, May 13, 1779. Hartford, 1779.

Davis, Samuel. Religion and Patriotism, the Constituents of a Good Soldier. Philadelphia, 1755.

Dwight, Timothy. A Sermon Preached at Northampton on the Twenty Eighth of November 1781. Hartford, n.d.

Lathrop, John. A Discourse Preached December 15, 1774. Being the Day Recommended by the Provincial Congress, to Be Observed in Thanksgiving to God for the Blessings Enjoyed; and Humiliation on Account of Public Calamities. Boston, 1774.

Mayhew, Jonathan. Popish Idolatry: A Discourse Delivered in the Chapel of Harvard College, May 8, 1765. Boston, 1765.

——— Two Discourses Delivered November 23, 1758. Being the Day Appointed by Authority to Be Observed as a Day of Public Thanksgiving for the Success of His Majesty's Arms, and Those of the King of Prussia, the Last Year. Boston, 1758.

——— Two Discourses Delivered October 25, 1759. Being the Day Appointed by Authority to Be Observed as a Day of Public Thanksgiving for the Success of His Majesty's Arms, More Particularly in the Reduction of Quebec, the Capital of Canada. Boston, 1759.

——— Two Sermons on the Nature, Extent and Perfections of the Divine Goodness, December 9, 1762. Being the Annual Thanksgiving of the Province. Boston, 1763.

Murray, John. Nehemiah, or The Struggle for Liberty. Newbury-Port, 1779.

Payson, Philip. A Sermon Preached before the Honorable Council and House of Representatives of Massachusetts Bay, May 27, 1778. Boston, 1778.

Pemberton, Ebenezer. A Sermon Preached to the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company in Boston, June 7, 1756. Boston, 1756.

Sherwood, Samuel. The Church's Flight into the Wilderness; or Address on the Times. Containing Some Very Interesting and Important Observations on Scripture Prophesies, Showing That Sundry of Them Plainly Relate to Great Britain and the American Colonies; and Are Fulfilling in the Present Day. Delivered on a Public Occasion, January 19, 1776. New York, 1776.

Sherwood, Samuel. A Sermon Containing Scriptural Instructions to Civil Rulers, and All Free Born Subjects . . . Delivered on the Public Fast, August 31, 1774. New Haven, 1774.

Stiles, Ezra. The United States Elevated to Glory and Honor. New Haven, 1783.

Tucker, John. The Validity of Presbyterian Orders. Boston, 1778.

Turner, Charles. A Sermon Preached before His Excellency Thomas Hutchinson, Esq., Governor; the Honorable His Majesty's Council, and the Honorable House of Representatives, of the Province of Massachusetts Bay in New England, May 26, 1773. Being the Anniversary of the Election of His Majesty's Council from the Said Province. Boston, 1773.

West, Samuel. Anniversary Sermon Preached at Plymouth, December 22, 1777. In Grateful Memory of the First Landing of Our Pious New England Ancestors. Boston, 1778.

——— A Sermon before the Honorable Council and the Honorable House of Representatives of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay in New England, May 29, 1776. Boston, 1776.

Newspapers, Magazines

American Catholic Historical Researches
American Catholic Quarterly Review
American Historical Review
American Journal and General Advertiser
Annual Historical Register
Boston Evening Post
Boston Gazette
Boston Post Boy
Catholic Historical Review
Connecticut Journal
Constitutional Gazette
Continental Journal and Weekly Advertiser
Dunlap's Maryland Gazette
Essex Gazette
Gazette Extraordinary of the State of South Carolina
Gazette of the State of South Carolina
Gun Digest

Independent Reflector
Journal of the American Irish Historical Society
Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society
Magazine of American History
Maryland Gazette
Maryland Gazette and Baltimore Advertiser
Maryland Journal
Maryland Journal and Baltimore Advertiser
Massachusetts Gazette and Boston Post Boy
Massachusetts Spy
New Hampshire Gazette
New York Gazette and Weekly Mercury
New York Journal
Newport Mercury
Pennsylvania Gazette
Pennsylvania Journal
Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography
Pennsylvania Packet
Providence Gazette
Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia
Rivington's New York Gazeteer
Royal Gazette
South Carolina Gazette
The Tablet (London)
Virginia Gazette (Rind)
Woodstock Letters

INDEX

Adams, John
  Catholicism and, 7-9, 11-12, 38-40, 64, 146, 183-84, 270
  Letters of Papinian directed towards, 67, 133
  On Canon and Feudal Law and, 11
  on Charles and John Carroll, 183-84
  on Dudleian Lectures, 7-8, 270
  on Episcopalians in Philadelphia, 110
  on freedom of American press, 25
  on Jesuits, 39
  on Jonathan Mayhew, 9
  on religious harmony in Pennsylvania, 211
Adams, Sam, 12-15, 63, 68, 271
America. *See* American Colonies
American Army
  at Boston, 30, 50, 124, 216-17, 276
  Irish in, 155, 157, 176, 230-33
  Maryland as source of supplies for, 198, 199-200
  Moylan and, 216-24
  See also American Revolution
American Colonies
  abhorrence of Tories in, 237-38
  address of Continental Congress to, 43
  as haven for dissenters, 3-4
  attitudes in at start of Revolution, 239
  British distrust of loyalties in, 122-24
  Captain Kirkwood on British army in, 157-58
  commercial agent for, 224
  commissary of French forces in, 131
  departure of Rawdon from, 261-62
  estimate of Catholics in, 152
  estimated population of, 139-41, 152
  Ezra Stiles on religious cohabitation in, 62
  Father Carroll on Catholics in, 95
  French alliance and religious climate in, 66
  Governor Bernard on Catholics in, 30-31
  Irish Quakers in, 158
  isolated states in, 276
  Jesuits in, 90-94
  need of to placate France, 274
  prospective allies of, 51
  protests against Quebec Act in, 25-47, 58-59, 83-84
  questionnaire from Lord Dartmouth to, 138
  religious climate of before 1774, 1-23
  religious practice of Catholics in, 144, 145, 151
  Reverend John Murray on, 53
  status of Catholics in, 69, 147, 153, 177-78
  vulnerability of, 48
  See also individual Colonies
American press
  John Adams on freedom of, 25
  lessening of attacks on Catholics in, 52
  opposition of to Quebec Act, 26-30
  reactions of Catholics to, 34
  See also Colonial press, New England press, and individual entries
American Revolution
  as Presbyterian war, 118-37, 272
  attitudes in America at start of, 239

- Catholics and, 69-70, 75, 108, 138-53, 156, 176, 177-207, 216-18, 230-33, 235, 240-42, 245, 250, 265, 279
- denunciation of clergy for part in, 121, 128
- descendants of Irish Quakers in, 158
- German mercenaries in, 129
- Irish in, 166-67, 172, 176
- Maryland before, 71-96
- Pennsylvania before, 97-117
- problems facing Congress on eve of, 48-49
- relative safety of Pennsylvania in, 209
- religious affiliations of patriots in, 154-76
- Stephen Moylan as outstanding Catholic soldier in, 218-24

Anburey, Thomas, 110, 129-30, 169, 211
Anglican episcopate, 121
Arnold, Benedict, 50-51, 66, 228
Asbury, Francis, 151, 152, 162

Baltimore, 77-80, 168, 203
Baltimore, Lord. *See* Calvert, George; Calvert, Cecil
Bancroft, George, 201-02, 205, 230, 241, 249, 265-66
Barbé-Marbois, François de, 61, 114, 131, 146-48
Barber, Daniel, 124, 126-27, 167
Baurmeister, Major Carl Leopold, 197, 198
Belfast News, 158
Berks County, 100, 105, 158
Blanchard, Claude, 79-80, 131-32, 170
Book of Martyrs, 5
Boston
- Anglicans and Congregationalists in, 5
- anti-Catholic feeling in, 9, 71, 149, 276
- assistance of Maryland and Pennsylvania to, 216-17, 276
- "authorized" churches in, 148
- civilities extended to Abbé Robin in, 148-49
- Claude Blanchard on Presbyterians of, 131-32
- England and bigotry of Presbyterians of, 132
- estimates concerning, 140-41
- Ezra Stiles on Catholic church in, 149
- Irish population of in 1770, 160
- political activity of Presbyterian clergy in, 131
- Pope Day and, 30, 50

Boston Evening Post, 16-17, 18, 26
Boston Gazette, 11-15, 27, 28
Boucher, Reverend Jonathan, 84-86, 180-81
British
- Catholics and manpower problem of, 243-44
- Presbyterians in Revolution acknowledged by, 135-36
- raids on Maryland by, 193, 200-01
- use of German mercenaries by, 129
- *See also* British army, British government, England, English

British army
- Captain Kirkwood on in America, 157-58
- Catholics in, 241, 245, 250, 265
- Father Farmer and, 215-16, 246
- Irish in, 241
- treatment of deserters by, 258
- Wilbur Siebert on enlistments in, 263

British government, 133-34, 135
- *See also* British, British army, England, English

British Volunteers of Ireland, 172
Brunhouse, Robert L., 113, 114-15
Bucks County, 99, 112, 158
Bucks County Dragoons, 265
Burnaby, Thomas, 77, 106, 147-49 150-51

Calvert, Cecil, 72
Calvert, George, 71-72
Calvinistic clergy. *See* Presbyterian clergy
Canada
- address to by Congress, 44-45
- as prospective ally of America, 51
- delegation to, 50-51, 183-84

- efforts of Congress to cultivate good will of, 49-50
- General Carleton and, 27, 29
- *See also* Canadians

Canadians
- Congress and, 46
- praise of by George Washington, 49
- problem of assimilation of, 24
- references to religion of, 33
- *See also* Canada

Carleton, General Guy, 27, 29

Carolinas, 145, 153
- *See also* North Carolina, South Carolina

Carroll, Charles
- acceptance of patriot cause by, 180, 182
- appraisal of by John Adams, 183-84
- as member of Congress, 185, 186
- as member of mission to Canada, 51, 183
- as noted son of Maryland, 23
- controversy of with Daniel Dulany, 80-82, 179, 182-83, 272
- election of to Senate, 206
- Jonathan Boucher on, 180, 181
- on "Flying Camp," 192

Carroll, Daniel, 206

Carroll, Father John
- appraisal of by John Adams, 184
- as member of mission to Canada, 51, 183
- Catholics in America and, 95, 147, 151
- friendship between Franklin and, 185
- on British raids, 200-01
- on Jesuits in Colonies, 92-93, 215

Catholic Church
- Antonio Gavin against, 17-18
- denouncements of, 8-23, 56-61
- opposition of New England press to, 11-17, 32-33

Catholic church, 78-79, 98-99, 144, 149-51, 203, 229

Catholic clergy, 206, 213-14
- *See also* Jesuits, Priests, Resident priests, and individual entries

Catholic Irish, 144, 155, 158, 161, 233-34

Catholic-name theory, 154-55, 162

Catholic Tories, 243, 249-50, 263-64, 277, 278

Catholicism
- animosity of New England clergy to, 34-38
- Barber on New England troops and, 124
- Boston and, 149
- enactments against in Militia Act, 105-06
- John Adams and, 7-9, 11-12, 38-40, 64, 146, 183-84, 270
- of French Canadians, 24, 33
- opposition to, 2-3, 5-6, 40-41, 66, 271
- "Poet's Corner" and, 47
- Revolution as war against, 124
- St. Joseph's Church and, 99
- Sam Adams and after French alliance, 63
- will of Philip Lee and, 75-76

Catholicity, 167, 176, 202
- *See also* Catholic Church, Catholic church, Catholicism, Catholics

Catholics
- antipathy to on frontier, 98
- as potential threat to patriots, 153
- at outbreak of war, 69-70, 73-77, 97, 108, 147, 177-78, 240
- attacks on, 54-55, 101-02, 142-43, 235-36
- attitude of laity towards after French alliance, 63-66
- Bishop Challoner on freedom of religion and, 106, 144-45
- Boston and, 5, 30, 50, 71, 132, 149, 216, 217, 276
- British and, 243-44
- cessation of attacks on by patriot press, 274
- claims for in Revolution, 143, 241, 242
- Dealey-Hubart affair and, 173-74
- distrust of in Colonies, 153, 175, 269-70
- elections of, 187, 206
- estimates of population of, 113-14, 143, 146, 152

  fewness of among immigrants, 98, 158, 161
  fewness of eligible recruits among, 153
  fewness of in Colonies, 146, 147, 150, 151-52, 153
  George Washington on loyalty of, 142, 279
  Governor Bernard on persecution of, 30-31
  in American Revolution, 138-53, 156, 177-207, 216, 218, 230-33, 235, 275-76, 279
  in British lines, 241, 245, 250, 265
  in Maryland, 23, 73-77, 87, 95, 96, 114, 143-45, 146, 153, 167, 179, 182, 187, 189, 191, 196, 197, 202, 206-07, 216, 217, 276, 277
  in New England, 6, 144, 146, 147, 152, 153
  in Pennsylvania, 95-96, 97-98, 99-100, 102-04, 105, 107, 112, 114, 144, 146, 153, 177, 179, 208-36, 277, 278
  in Philadelphia, 106, 113-14, 115-16
  in Society of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, 108
  instructions from Cecil Calvert to, 72
  legislation passed against, 42-43, 74, 75, 76, 77
  masonic membership held by, 210
  need for change in attitude towards, 49, 52, 69-70, 75, 274
  New England clergy and, 22, 52-55, 84-86
  Quebec Act and, 26-29, 240
  ratio of in Colonies, 152
  reactions of to address of Congress, 46
  reactions of to attacks by American press, 34
  religious practice of in America, 144, 145, 151
  report of Father Carroll on, 95
  resentment of towards detractors, 47
  resolutions of Suffolk County concerning, 42-43
  Tories among, 153
  Volunteers of Ireland and, 266
  warning of Franklin concerning, 21
  See also Catholic Church, Catholic church, Catholicism
Challoner, Bishop Richard, 106, 144-45
Charles County, 90-91, 196, 200
Charleston, 30, 171-73, 254
Chester County, 99, 112
Christian Standard, 142
Church of England, 76
  See also Established Church, Episcopacy, Episcopalianism
Church of Rome. *See* Catholic Church
Church of the Blessed Sacrament, 100
Clifton, Alfred, 244, 245, 247-48, 250, 264
Clinton, General Sir Henry, 243, 249, 251-52, 259, 260, 277
College of New Jersey, 22, 135
Collin, Nicholas, 124-25, 151-52
Colonial press, 169
  See also American press, New England press, and individual entries
Communicants, 89, 94, 100
Congregational Church, 5
Congregationalists
  as chief opponents of British government, 134
  distrust of by Established Church, 122-23
  expansion by, 120
  in New England, 5, 147-48
Connecticut Courant, 16-17
Continental Army. *See* American Army
Continental Congress
  approval of Suffolk County Resolves by, 43
  Charles Carroll as member of, 185, 186
  conduct of concerning Quebec Act, 43-45
  criticism of, 45-46, 66
  financial contributions to, 227
  invitation to for Catholic services, 65-66
  John Hancock as president of, 220
  need of for allies, 49-51, 52, 69-70
  problems facing on eve of war, 48-49

- scheme to defraud, 228
- Tories on toleration of popery by, 67
- Cooper, Doctor Samuel, 20-21, 69, 131, 132, 274
- Cornwallis, General Lord Charles, 259-60, 261
- Cresswell, Nicholas, 109, 128, 150-51, 169
- Crèvecoeur, M. G. Jean de, 150
- Cumberland County, 100, 163

- Dealey-Hubart affair, 173-74
- Delaware, 151-52, 161, 162
- Dissenters, 3-4, 72, 81-82
- Donegal, Marquis of, 158, 163-64
- Drayton, John, 139, 173-74
- Drayton, Judge William Henry, 40-41, 173
- Duché, Jacob, 186
- Dudleian Lectures, 7-8, 9-10, 20-21, 57, 270
- Dudley, Paul, 7
- Dulany, Daniel. *See* Dulany-Carroll controversy
- Dulany-Carroll controversy, 80-82, 179, 182-83, 272
- *Dunlap's Maryland Gazette*, 136
- Dwight, Timothy, 59-61, 66

- England
  - address of Congress to, 43-44
  - distrust of Congregationalists and Presbyterians by, 122-24
  - hatred for fostered by Payson, 54
  - Irish immigrants as enemies of, 164
  - opposition to break with, 41
  - opposition to Catholicism in, 2-3
  - problems brought by Peace of Paris to, 24
  - repercussions of civil war in, 73
  - Tudor sovereigns and religion in, 1
- English
  - arrival of in Pennsylvania, 162
  - beyond Appalachian Mountains, 175
  - Catholics in Maryland predominantly, 143-44, 179
  - majority of in Maryland, 277-78
  - Maryland as asylum for, Catholic, 71
  - Pennsylvania Catholics, 112, 233
  - predominance of in Pennsylvania, 99, 112, 114, 115, 208
  - Presbyterian bigotry and, 132
  - *See also* British, British army, British government, England
- Episcopacy, 124, 134-35
  - *See also* Church of England, Episcopalianism, Established Church
- Episcopal clergy, 80-81
- Episcopalianism, 19
  - *See also* Church of England, Episcopacy, Established Church
- Episcopalians, 110, 148
- *Essex Gazette*, 33
- Established Church, 71-72, 122-23
  - *See also* Church of England, Episcopacy, Episcopalianism

- Farmer, Father Ferdinand
  - as first priest to hold civil office in Pennsylvania, 214-15
  - as German by birth, 213
  - as trustee of University of State of Pennsylvania, 110-11, 214
  - assistance of at marriage of British soldiers, 215-16
  - Griffin on, 212
  - marriage register of, 117
  - mission at Goshenhoppen and, 100
  - on Catholics in New York, 151
  - on communicants in Cumberland County, 100
  - on Howe and Roman Catholic Volunteers, 246
  - on religious freedom in Pennsylvania, 107-08
- Fee Bill, 80
- Fenwick, Bishop Benedict, 145
- Fenwick, Captain Ignatius, 188, 197
- Fenwick, Ignatius, 187, 192
- "Flying Camp," 191-92
- Fourth Continental Dragoons, 221-22
- France
  - as prospective ally of America, 51
  - attitude towards after alliance, 63-66

  cessation of attacks on by patriot press, 274
  James Moylan in, 224
  New England clergy and alliance with, 56
  Reverend Samuel Payson and, 54
  Samuel Cooper as friend of, 274
Franklin, Benjamin, 21, 63, 68, 156, 185, 228-29
Fredericktown, 169, 203
French
  capture of Rawdon by, 262
  fewness of, 144
  opposition to professorship of at Yale College, 55-56
  Presbyterians in Revolution and, 135-36
French Acadians, 77-80, 203
French and Indian Wars, 5-6, 8-9, 101, 269-70
French Canadians. *See* Canadians
French forces, 131

Gavin, Antonio, 17-18, 270
Georgia Loyalists, 265
Germain, Lord George, 249, 251-52
German Catholics, 99, 100, 104, 105, 208-09, 233
German mercenaries, 129-30
Germans
  beyond Appalachian Mountains, 175
  Catholics in Pennsylvania predominantly, 112, 144, 179, 233
  in Pennsylvania, 98, 99, 100, 104, 105, 111-12, 114, 115, 162, 208-09, 213, 278
  in Pennsylvania Line, 232-33
  religious denominations of, 112
Goshenhoppen, 99-100
Graydon, Alexander, 127, 136, 231
Griffin, Martin I. J., 142-43, 158, 176, 212-13, 249-50, 264
Guilday, Doctor Peter, 154-55, 213-14, 249-50, 275

Hancock, John, 220
Harvard College, 7
Hazard, Ebenezer, 22, 66
Heffernan, John, 80
Heinrichs, Captain Johann, 130, 245, 262-63
Henry, Patrick, 63
Howe, Admiral Richard, 112-13, 125, 140, 156, 243-44, 246, 263, 277
Hunter, Father George, 91, 94, 200, 201

Ignatius, 89-90, 189-90
Independent Reflector, 21
Inglis, Charles, 67, 133
Irish
  advertisements for missing, 169
  as enemies of England, 164
  as Protestants, 158, 160, 162
  beyond Appalachian Mountains, 175
  Catholics among, 144, 158, 161, 233-34
  disparagement of, 156-57
  in American Army, 155, 157, 230-33
  in British army, 241
  in Maryland, 168
  in Massachusetts, 159-60
  in North Carolina, 171-73
  in Pennsylvania, 114-15, 161, 162-63, 164, note 37, 166, 208
  in Virginia, 169-71
  on frontier, 111-12, 170-71
  support of Revolution by, 166-67
  to America, 98, 158-66, 172-73
  tolerance of, 159
  Tories among, 156
Irish Quakers, 158

Jesuits
  Father Moseley as former, 205
  frequency of name Ignatius and, 189
  in Colonies, 74, 90-94, 144-45, 190
  John Adams on, 39
  Puritan allegations against, 6-7
  Timothy Dwight on suppression of, 59
Jews, 5

Kemble, Lieutenant Colonel Stephen, 251
King's American Regiment, 265
Kirkwood, Captain Robert, 157-58

Lancaster County, 112, 163
Laurens, Henry, 67, 133
Lee, General Harry, 230
Lee, Philip, 75-76
Letters of Papinian, 67, 133
Lievers, Father Arnold, 89, 187
Loudoun, Lord John, 102
Louisburg, 6, 270
Loyal American Regiment, 265
Loyal New Englanders, 265

Maryland
  anti-Catholic legislation in, 74
  as source of supplies for army, 198, 199-200
  assistance given to Boston by, 276
  before American Revolution, 71-96
  Catholics from in Revolution, 177-207, 216, 217, 276
  Catholics in, 23, 73-77, 87, 95, 96, 114, 143-45, 146, 153, 167, 179, 187, 189, 191, 196, 197, 202, 206-07, 216, 217, 276, 277
  enactment of Toleration Act in, 72-73
  established church of, 76
  increase in enlistments in, 193-94
  intolerance of government of, 278
  Irish in, 167-68
  Jesuits in, 144-45, 189-90
  majority of English in, 277-78
  populations in, 88, 141, 168
  Puritans in, 5, 73-77
  raids on, 193, 200-01
  sufferings of, 197-98
  Tories and, 204-05, 277
Maryland Assembly, 75, 80-81
Maryland Gazette, 81-82
Maryland Line, 196
Maryland Loyalists, 265
Maryland militia, 144, 188-89, 192-93, 207
Maryland Senate, 206
Mass, 65-66, 150
Massachusetts
  establishment of Congregational Church in, 5
  estimate of population of, 140
  Irish in, 159-60
  prayers for France in, 65
  religious denominations in, 148
  religious exclusiveness of, 4-5
  religious intolerance in, 71
  Sam Adams on popery in, 13-15
Massachusetts Spy, 18, 32-33, 34
A Master Key to Popery, 17-18, 31
Mattingly, Father John, 93-94
Mayhew, Jonathan, 9-11, 120
McRoberts, Patrick, 109, 112, 140, 148 149, 150, 161
Meade, George, 226-27
Mease, James, 210, 227, 228
Militia, 144, 188-89, 192-93, 207, 209-10
Militia Act, 105-06
Molyneaux, Father Robert, 212-13, 215-16
Montgomery County, 99, 200
Montresor, Captain-Major John, 244-45
Morristown, 161-62
Moseley, Father Joseph, 90, 205
Moylan, Stephen, 216-24
Muhlenberg, Reverend Henry, 109, 245

New Castle, 98
New England
  Catholics in, 144, 146, 147, 152, 153
  Congregationalists and Episcopalians in, 147-48
  harmony among troops in, 127, 167
  religious intolerance in, 4-5, 19, 33, 124
  tribute to soldiery of, 155
New England clergy
  alliance with France and, 56
  anti-Catholicism of, 22, 34-38, 54-55, 271
  claims by of support for Revolution, 128
  division of on toleration of Catholics, 52
  espousal of Whig cause by, 124-25
  influence of, 35
  political interference of, 35-38
  role of in Revolution, 120
  suspicions of Anburey concerning, 129

  suspicions of Catholics aroused by, 52-54
  Tory derision of conforming, 53
  See also Presbyterian clergy
New England press, 11-17, 32-33
New Haven, 150
New Jersey, 146, 152, 153, 161-62
New Jersey Volunteers, 265
New York
  absence of Catholic church in, 150-51
  absence of priests in, 146-47
  Burnaby on religious denominations in, 150
  Catholics in, 96, 144, 146, 150, 151, 152, 153
  death of Alfred Clifton in, 250
  Ireland and, 161
  opposition to Quebec Act in, 31-32
New York Gazette and Weekly Mercury, 161
New York Journal, 26
New York Volunteers, 265
Newport, 28, 30, 149
Newport Mercury, 18, 29, 31, 33, 34
North Carolina, 152, 171
  See also Carolinas, South Carolina
North Carolina Volunteers, 265
North Ireland, 158, 159, 161, 163-64, 172
Northampton, 14-15
Northampton County, 112

On Canon and Feudal Law, 11

Paca, William, 82, 182
Patriot cause, 179, 180, 182, 279
Patriot press, 274
Patriots
  branding of by Samuel Cooper, 132
  Catholics as potential threat to, 153
  Irish immigrants as, 159
  refutation of generalizations concerning, 238
  religious affiliations of in Revolution, 154-76
  Tories on toleration of popery by, 67
Payson, Reverend Samuel, 54
Peace of Paris, 24
Pennsylvania
  appeal to recruits in, 127
  assistance given by to Boston, 216-17, 276
  before American Revolution, 97-117
  Bishop Challoner on Jesuits in, 144
  Catholic Tories in, 277
  Catholic troops from, 167, 216-17, 218, 276
  Catholics in, 95-100, 102-04, 105, 107, 112, 114, 144, 146, 153, 177, 179, 208-36, 277, 278
  estimate of population of, 139-40
  first priest in civil office in, 214-15
  Germans in, 98, 99, 100, 104, 105, 111-12, 114, 115, 162, 208-09, 213, 278
  immigrants to, 162-63
  Irish in, 114-15, 161, 162-63, 166, 208
  militia and, 209-10
  predominance of English and Germans in, 112, 114, 115, 208, 278
  religious tolerance in, 97, 98, 106-08, 110, 208, 211, 212, 278
  resident priests in, 144
Pennsylvania Gazette, 28-29
Pennsylvania Line, 230-34
Pennsylvania Loyalists, 265
Pennsylvania Packet, 263-64
Philadelphia
  appeal to Catholic Tories in, 263-64
  British auxiliaries in, 245
  Catholic churches in, 98-99, 144, 229
  Catholics in, 106, 113-14
  cavalry unit from, 220-21
  estimate of dwellings in, 113
  estimate of Tories in, 262-63
  estimates of population of, 112-13, 140-41
  fewness of Episcopalians in, 110
  German community in, 209
  immigrants to, 98, 161, 164, note 37
  Irish Quakers in, 158
  predominance of English in, 112
  records of baptisms in, 116-17
  records of burials in, 115-16
  religious harmony in, 109-10

"Poets Corner," 47
Pope Day, 30, 50, 173
Popery
  as a main issue of Quebec Act, 24-25
  Charles Turner on, 19-20
  Ezra Stiles and, 61-62
  fear of among troops at Boston, 126-27
  fear of New England clergy for, 55
  French alliance and, 66
  Louisburg as citadel of, 6, 270
  Puritan abhorrence of, 5-7
  Rivington's Gazette on, 67-68
  Sam Adams as foe of, 12-15, 271
  Samuel Cooper as friend of, 274
  Samuel Davis on dangers of, 22-23
  Solomon Southwick on, 18
  Tories on toleration of by patriots, 67
Port Tobacco, 90-91
Presbyterian clergy, 121, 128, 130, 131, 163
  See also New England clergy
Presbyterian war, 118-37, 272
Presbyterianism, 19, 118-37, 158, 161-63, 168, 176
Presbyterians
  acknowledged part in Revolution, 135-36
  among Irish in Maryland, 168
  as chief opponents of British government, 134
  bigotry of, 108-09, 132
  British distrust of, 122-24
  distrust of Established Church by, 123
  indictment of by Tories, 132
  Irish immigrants predominantly, 158, 159
  Irish majority as in Revolution, 176
  Scotch-Irish composing in Colonies, 133
Priest, 214-15
  See also Jesuits, Priests, Resident priests, and individual entries
Priests, 145, 204, 207
  See also Jesuits, Priest, Resident priests, and individual entries
Prince of Wales American Volunteers, 265
Protestants
  as first settlers, 269
  intolerant attitude of in Colonies, 31, 177-78, 269
  Irish as, 158, 160, 162
  See also, Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Puritans
Providence Gazette, 15-16
Puritan clergy, 121
Puritanism, 150
Puritans
  abhorrence of popery by, 5-7
  admittance of to Maryland government, 73
  Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* and, 5
  treatment of Maryland Catholics by, 73-77
  See also Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Protestants

Quakers, 5, 166, 278
Quebec Act, 24-47, 58-59, 83-84, 240, 265, 271, 275
Queen's American Rangers, 265

Ramsay, David, 33, 158, 234
Rawdon, Francis, 172, 251, 253-62
Reading, 100, 101-02, 105
Reeves, Lieutenant Enos, 171-72, 223
Resident priests, 144-47
Rhode Island, 64-65
Rivington's Gazette, 67-68, 69
Robin, Abbé Claude, 79, 113-14, 132, 141, 148-49, 160, 202
Roman Catholic Volunteers, 244-49, 263-65, 277
Romish Church. *See* Catholic Church

St. Charles County, 88, 188, 196, 202
St. Inigoe's Manor, 89
St. Joseph's Church, 99, 116-17, 245
St. Mary's County, 87-88, 187-88, 194, 199-200, 202, 229-31
St. Peter's Church, 78-79, 82-83
Scotch-Irish, 133-34, 241
Scots, 162, 208
Serle, Ambrose, 125-26, 156-57, 158, 159

Sewall, Reverend Charles, 203
Shea, John Gilmary, 241, 242, 249
Siebert, Wilbur H., 252, 263
Society of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, 108, 216, 226
South Carolina, 152, 172-75, 262
  See also Carolinas, North Carolina
South Carolina Loyalists, 265
Southwick, Solomon, 18, 34, 271
Steinmeyer. *See* Farmer, Father Ferdinand
Stiles, Ezra, 19, 61-62, 66, 139, 149-50
Suffolk County Resolves, 42-43

Test Act, 158-59
Toleration Act, 72-73
Tories
  abhorrence of in America, 237-38
  among Catholics in Colonies, 153, 243, 249-50, 264, 277
  among Irish, 156
  conforming clergy derided by, 53
  estimate of, 262-63
  indictment of Presbyterians by, 132
  on toleration of popery by patriots, 67
  regiments formed by, 172, 244-49, 263-65, 277
Tory press, 52, 67, 274
  See also individual entries
Toryism, 204-05

University of the State of Pennsylvania, 110-11, 214

Van Tyne, Claude H., 121-22
Virginia, 5, 22-23, 73-74, 96, 141, 145, 152-53, 169-71
Volunteers of Ireland, 249, 250-63, 266, 277

Walpole, Horace, 126, 135
Walton, Father James, 89-90, 187, 201
War of Independence. *See* American Revolution
Washington, George, 49-51, 142, 218, 219-20, 222, 259, 279
Whigs. *See* Patriot cause, Patriot party, Patriots
Witherspoon, Reverend John, 134, 135
Woolen Act, 159

Yale College, 55-56, 61
York, 14, 158, 209

About this book

Catholics and the American Revolution was designed by William Nicoll of EDIT, INC. It was set in the composing room of TAMWILL CORPORATION. The text is 12 on 14 Bodoni Book; the reduced matter, 10 on 12; and the notes, 8 on 10. The display type is Bodoni Book (Mono 875).

It was printed by PHOTOPRESS, INC. on WARREN'S 60-pound "1854" paper and bound by A. C. ENGDAHL AND COMPANY, INC. in BANCROFT cloth.

DATE DUE

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

JUN [redacted]

[redacted]

FEB [redacted] 1993

[redacted]

JUN 30 2008

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

E269 .C3M5
Catholics and the American Revolution; a
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00136 6865